Dr. Peter Aldag

Jewry in England: A Thousand-Year History

Volume 5: Increasing Influence of the Jews (1754-1830)

Jewry in England: A Thousand-Year History

The volumes of this study:

Volume 1: From the Earliest Years To Expulsion (669-1290)

Volume 2: The Return of the Jews Under Cromwell (1290-1658)

Volume 3: Royal Protectors of the Jews (1658-1714)

Volume 4: Early Emancipation Struggles and Jewish Defeat (1714-1753)

Volume 5: Increasing Influence of the Jews (1754-1830)

Volume 6: Emancipation (1830-1866)

Volume 7: Jewish Domination (1867-1942)

For all front matter see Volume 1.

Volume 5: Contents

The Judaisation of Leading Circles
A New Wave of Immigration
The Jews Reorganise
A Tidal Wave of Jewish Crime
Jewish Financiers
Nathan Mayer Rothschild and Friends
The Power of Propaganda
Freemasonry
Napoleon and the Jews
The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews
Laws of Attrition
The Fall of the City of London, the Bulwark of the Anti-Jewish Movement
Translator’s Appendix: ‘Jewish Predominance’
Bibliography

The Judaisation of Leading Circles

The Jews' frontal attack of 1753 had failed. It was recognised that the moral strength of the people was still too great to win the battle in this way. The enemy camp first had to be undermined in order to make it sufficiently vulnerable for a new general offensive. Thus, in the 80 years following the 1753 setback, it is possible to detect the almost imperceptible excavation taking place under the surface of England's institutions. This endeavour, to hollow out ideological foundations, was particularly focussed on the stronghold of the Jews' opponents, the City of London, which had already taken the lead against the Jews under Cromwell. It was the City's representatives who most actively ignited resistance in Parliament and elsewhere, therefore change had to be brought about in the City if there were to be any chance of success.

The Jews' tactics of attrition undoubtedly include the mixing of Aryan and Jewish blood. It is probably irrelevant to discuss whether these intermarriages took place consciously with this aim in mind. In general, when it comes to the Jewish Question, it is not necessary to discuss whether some process or other to advance Judaism in a country has taken place intentionally according to a well-thought-out plan. We believe that this does happen, but the only thing that matters when deciding on countermeasures is to assess the consequences of the various Jewish behaviours and the Jewish system as a whole on the future of a people. If these prove to be detrimental, then they should be combatted purely out of the instinct for self-preservation, with no need to consider the question of whether this damage is intentional or not.

In our opinion, we do not need to decide whether intermarriage was part of a well-thought-out system for weakening the host nation, beginning mainly through strategic unions with the ruling class. One could respond that the Jew himself – as we will see later – believes in keeping his race pure and even considers it necessary for his people's future. However, a supporter of the theory that the Jews have a premeditated plan for world domination could counter this by saying that in every struggle individual members of a group have to sacrifice themselves for the greater good and so bloodlines of Jewish families must perish together with families of the host nation they have contaminated, unless the inferior race gains the upper hand in such mixing. We see that this mixing would also have an internal logic, or particular benefit, of its own, but there is no space here to go into this in more detail. We are merely stating that, regardless of whatever view is held, throughout recorded history intermarriage has always been one of the ways in which Judah gradually attains supremacy in a polity. Given all of this, the most practical method (and the only method that works) is to decide to combat the Jews based solely on the result of their general behaviour, because in the fight for the existence of a people, a defensive act cannot depend on the moral intention of the people harmed by the influence of an alien body: here the sole and exclusive decision to be made is for the preservation of the people, for which every means must necessarily be justified.

But let us return to the question of intermarriage. Before we return to English history, we must point out a general circumstance that repeatedly emerges with these unions in the history of peoples.

The first intermarriages mostly took place in aristocratic circles or at least in those closely associated with it. The nobility of the 18th and 19th centuries felt their position threatened by the capitalist, who was increasingly making advances in society, and therefore decided to join forces with him. This was particularly the case in circles that were detached from the masses. As a result, a large percentage of the nobility is no longer suitable to lead the fight against this alien influence,

preferring instead to accept it into their ranks as equals. As long as the so-called monied nobility is made up of members of the same (Aryan) blood, there is no threat of a blood-based decomposition of a people. But it then becomes a crime against one's own nation if some of this blood is Jewish. Then the general adverse consequences for a national body occur, as the Jews and their descendants gradually wrest leadership out of the hands of those who had previously been responsible for the nation's fate. Imperceptibly at first, the Jew then takes over the reins of the government and the economy and, with the ruthlessness that is unique to him, suppresses the forces that are pushing upward from the people. The leading men will slowly become completely alienated, and a large part of the people will join the Jewish system for better advancement, thus strengthening the Jewish front. As a result, their power becomes ever greater and the fight of the upright people, who put their own ego aside and sacrifice their social position for the good of the whole, becomes increasingly hopeless. Once the Jew has created this situation, he no longer remains on the defensive, but uses every possible means to silence the fighters who stand up for the people and works to ruin them in every way. This too is seen from history and is apparent to the writer of these lines from the example of many contemporary Englishmen. Therefore, once the hour of decision has arrived for the Jewish Question globally, a position will have to be taken on the extent to which some of the nobility is to be held responsible for the Judaisation of a nation.[1]

In the final volume of this study we will attempt to determine the extent to which intermarriage has taken place among the English nobility. Here it is only necessary to show the beginnings of this process.

We have already seen that Gideon married into a respectable Christian family. His son, who as we know was made a baronet in 1759, in 1766 married the daughter of Sir John Eardley Wilmot, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. He first entered Parliament in 1770 as a member for Cambridgeshire, then represented Midhurst, Coventry and finally Wallingford.[2] In 1789 he was raised to the Irish peerage as Lord Eardley. He was called 'Mr. Pitt's Jew' because he enjoyed the special confidence of the great English statesman.[3] His two sons predeceased him without leaving any descendants. His three daughters married Baron Say and Sele, Sir Culling Smith, M.P., and Colonel Childers,[4] whose best-known descendants were Hugh Culling Eardley Childers (Chancellor of the Exchequer in one of Gladstone's governments), William Eden (5th Baron Auckland), and his cousin, Miss Rolanda F. Childers.[5]

Sampson Gideon's sister, Rachel de Paiba, also married into the English nobility. Her blood can be found today in the family of the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl Marshal, i.e. the highest representative of the English nobility.[6]

In 1757 Gideon married his daughter to William Hall Gage, 2nd Viscount Gage, with a dowry of £40,000, a massive amount for the time.[7]

---

1 The Jew Jacob Wasserman, in his book *My Life as German and Jew* (p. 144 ff.) also attributes responsibility to the nobility.

2 Landa, p. 286. Translator's note: I did not find this information at the source given, however the information can be found in Namier & Brooke, § GIDEON [afterwards EARDLEY], Sir Sampson [see Translator's Bibliography]. The same source also reproduces Thomas Orde's scathing comment about Sampson Gideon's name change, which is described as 'but a *half* measure, for the cloven foot is sadly exposed by the preservation of *Sampson*.'

3 Hertz, p. 101.

4 Alger, p. 61.

5 Solomons: *Satirical and Political Prints*, p. 210; Hertz, p. 101; Mesquita, p. 241.

6 Solomons: *Satirical and Political Prints*, p. 210; Mesquita, p. 241.

7 Nichols, Vol. VI, p. 278.

Hertz also reports on the intermarriage of the stockbroker and dramatist Moses Mendes (d. 1758) with an English woman, whose sons adopted their mother's maiden name of 'Head' by royal warrant after his death, and whose grandson Francis Bond Head was made a baronet in 1838.[8] We also see that in the 18th century a certain Benjamin da Costa entered into a mixed marriage. He joined the postal service, the first civil servant of Jewish birth in England, while his son was in the excise.[9]

The Jewess Kitty Villareal [née Catherine Rachel da Costa] was an ancestor of a number of English noble families. In her first marriage, which produced two children, she was married to a wealthy fellow Jew. He left her a fortune of around £200,000 and so soon enough new suitors appeared: she married the Englishman William Mellish, who came from a distinguished family and who won a seat in Parliament in 1741 with his wife's money. In 1751, Mellish left the House of Commons to become Commissioner of Excise at £1,000 a year, and nine years later he was promoted to be Receiver-General of Customs at £1,500 a year.[10] After his wife's death, he married Anne Gore, whose family was the ancestral line of the current Earl Winterton and the current Colonial Secretary William Ormsby-Gore, now Lord Harlech: both friends of the Jews and enemies of the new Germany. The latter is described by the Jews themselves as a 'true friend of the Jews'.[11] Kitty Villareal's daughter from her first marriage, a full Jew, married the heir of the 1st Viscount Galway, which means that all of the members of this noble family descended from her. In later years, her granddaughter married the Marquis of Crewe, so this family too can also be regarded as Jewish.[12]

Abraham [renamed William on baptism], Kitty Villareal's son from her first marriage, may have tried to get into Parliament with the help of the Duke of Newcastle, as a letter makes reference to his presence at a by-election. He was married to the Englishwoman Elizabeth Hallifax, who came from a very distinguished family: one of her brothers was Samuel Hallifax, Bishop of Gloucester and later Bishop of St. Asaph, another was Dr. Robert Hallifax, personal physician to the Prince of Wales, later King George IV.

A daughter from this marriage married a man who reportedly tricked her out of her inheritance, then she fell into debt and was imprisoned, while Abraham's illegitimate daughter (who inherited nothing and was apprenticed to a dressmaker) married a man named Dutton who became Mayor of Chesterfield.[13]

Charles, a son from Kitty Villareal's second marriage (to Mellish), entered Parliament for the Newark constituency in 1774 and was therefore the second half-Jew to gain a seat, as Gideon's son already had already been elected as an MP for the borough of Cambridgeshire in 1770. Charles Mellish married and had children. His son Henry Francis Mellish became a colonel in the British army and found his way into the highest circles, losing nearly all of his estates during gambling evenings with the Prince Regent, George IV. Colonel Mellish went through the Peninsular War as aide-de-camp to Wellington, before dying childless at the age of 35 in 1817. 'Is it possible,' asks the

8 Hertz, pp. 101-2. Translator's note: Additional data from the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (s. v. MENDES [MENDEZ], MOSES) and *Dictionary of National Biography* (s. v. MENDES, MOSES).
9 Landa, p. 290.
10 Landa, pp. 271-80; Picciotto, pp. 103-4.
11 Landa, p. 282. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from original source.
12 Landa, pp. 271, 282.
13 Landa, pp. 282-6.

Jew Landa, ‘that Wellington, who was a friend to Jewish emancipation, was influenced by Mellish, who was everybody’s favourite, and whose grandmother was a Jewess?’[14]

This short list of mixed marriages may suffice to show very clearly the influence that the marriages of a very few Jews must have had on the leading circles of the time. Even King George IV had two people around him who were related to Jews or related by marriage, Colonel Mellish and Dr. Robert Hallifax, the brother-in-law of Kitty Villareal's fully Jewish son. There can be no doubt that all of these people played their part in promoting the Jewish cause.

The descendants of the rich Jew Jacob Bernal also entered into mixed marriages. His baptised son Mr. Ralph Bernal married a Miss Da Silva, of a Portuguese-Jewish family, and became a magistrate, a land owner and a member of Parliament. In 1844, Ralph’s son, Captain Ralph Bernal, married the heiress of Sir Thomas Osborne of Newtown Anner, Tipperary, and on marriage took the surname of Osborne in addition to his own, thus becoming Mr. Bernal Osborne.[15]

We also find mixed marriages in the middle classes towards the end of the 18th century. Picciotto explains this phenomenon in the following way:

> The Jews have ever enjoyed the reputation of being admirers of the fair sex. Many a Samson became an easy prey to many a Delilah. The golden tresses, the sapphire eyes, the soft voices of the fair daughters of Albion did more to draw followers from the Synagogue to the Church than is usually imagined. Nor did lovely English girls disdain the considerable fortunes and dark complexions of the Jews, more especially of those of Sephardic origin.[16]

The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews even went as far as to grant a type of matrimonial loan of £500 to £600 for such mixed marriages.[17] We will hear more about this in a later chapter when we come to discuss the activities of this organisation.

Quite apart from the disintegration of the blood, such inter-marriage between the English and the Jews were the reason why the sharp differences that had been identified between the two groups in the tumultuous year of 1753 were, if initially hardly visible, at least gradually eroded. Inter-marriage brought the two peoples into contact with one another, and with the help of the ever-expanding propaganda in favour of the Jews and the lack of a counter-movement, people believed that the previously prevailing prejudices had to be dropped. The existence of these mixed marriages was also a reason for the Jews’ eventually emancipation, and while it may not be a major reason, it is still one which should not be overlooked.

---

14 Landa, p. 286. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. It may be something of an exaggeration to call Wellington ‘a friend to Jewish emancipation’ – see later in this volume (text corresponding to footnote 143), and Volume 6 (text corresponding to footnotes 19 and 74) for occasions on which Wellington thwarted Jewish political plans in the House of Lords.

15 Picciotto, p. 211. Translator’s note: Mr. Bernal Osborne can be found in Volume 6, working for the cause of Jewish emancipation when he supports the Jew David Salomons in his attempt to (illegally) take up his seat in Parliament.

16 Picciotto, p. 200. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

17 Picciotto, p. 285. Translator’s note: This appears to be a misreading of the source, if indeed the source reference is correct – the sum is referred to in the source, but has nothing to do with marriage grants (or any sort of grant), which are not mentioned. I would cautiously suggest that if there were grants of £500 available in 19th-century England for a Christian to marry a Jew, there would scarce be a member of the poorer classes, whether Christian or Jewish, who would not contemplate entering into such a union, if only for financial convenience.

A New Wave of Immigration

From the second half of the 18th century onwards, ever larger masses of Jews poured into England from Holland, Germany and Poland. It was mainly external factors that caused the Jews to abandon their previous residence in favour of England, where they already enjoyed unfettered freedom at that time.[18] The Poet Laureate Robert Southey, who in 1808 published a description of England under the pseudonymous identity of Spanish traveller Manuel Alvarez Espriella, even stated that: 'It is not merely the open exercise of their religion which is permitted them, they are even suffered to write and publish against Christianity.'[19] As early as 1755, numerous new arrivals of Jews from Lisbon were noted. A major earthquake had caused considerable damage there,[20] and some of the Jews likely did not want to stay there during the years of reconstruction, as such times generally yield less profit.

The partition of Poland in 1772 also brought new waves of Jews. Due to the lack of any official documents, their number can no longer be determined today. But it was evidently significant, because after some time the elders of the Jewish community announced that the synagogue's charity chest was almost empty and that it was no longer possible to support the Jewish newcomers who were roaming around in droves. In addition, increased crime was observed, with thefts and robberies committed by Jews being commonplace. A brazen murder-robbery in Chelsea, carried out by a gang of Jewish criminals, forced the government to finally take action. They contacted the Jewish community to work with them to prevent further immigration. The synagogue elders declared their willingness to assist in this endeavour, and published their decision to cease providing relief to foreign Jews 'who had left their country without good cause'. In December 1771, the government ordered immigration authorities to only admit Jews with passports issued by British representatives abroad, and ordered that Jews were not longer allowed to free passage on the king's cross-channel packet boats, although for some reason this latter edict would not put into effect until October 1774, and even then likely not properly enforced [see footnote]. It evidently remained difficult for local authorities to bring Jewish criminality under control, because the Lord Mayor of London offered to grant passes to poor Jews for a return journey to the south coast of England if they agreed to return to their country of origin, where they would be transported free of charge.[21] Unfortunately, it is not known how many people, if any, made use of this offer.

---

18 Picciotto, p. 180; Hyamson: *History*, p. 236; Rumney, p. 331.

19 Espriella, Vol III, p. 145. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Aldag was apparently unaware that Espriella was Southey's pseudonym; in the interests of accuracy all references to this author as a Spanish traveller have been updated to reflect this fact.

20 Margoliouth: *History*, Vol. II, p. 94.

21 *Calendar of Home Office Papers*, Vol. 1770-1772, pp. 355-358; Hyamson: *History*, pp. 232, 237. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from Hyamson, p. 237. Note that the meeting held by the Home Office to restrict Jewish immigration only came about in response to the public outcry after the Chelsea murder-robbery, and the government's proposed measures to control immigration appear to have been ineffective, as per the judgement of Jewish historian Todd M. Endelman [p.202]: 'As there was no drop in the 1770s and thereafter in the rate of Jewish immigration to England, in the level of Jewish poverty, or in the extent of Jewish criminality, it is very probable that the regulation was never conscientiously enforced.' For more on the Chelsea case, in which an eight-man criminal gang of Dutch Jews was led by a university-trained physician, and which remained infamous in England well into the 19th century, see Pelham Vol I, pp. 227-230 [both books in Translator's Bibliography].

The siege of Gibraltar by the French in 1781 caused new waves of starving Jews to immigrate to England.[22] Since they had of course effectively arrived destitute, they were not particularly welcomed by the English or by their fellow Jews.

The events in France and Poland, which led to the latter's renewed partition in 1793, saw new masses of Jews on the move. Once again, swarms of Hebrews poured over England. The repercussions may have been the same as before, because the government felt compelled to pass an extensive if temporary law to prevent this unwanted immigration, which placed stringent demands on the newcomers. The act, known as Lord Grenville's Alien Act, 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 4), which was renewed annually until 1826, made a passport compulsory, and foreigners had to fulfil various conditions, for example, hand over any weapons in their personal possession. They were also subject to a strict registration requirement, and the government also had the right to assign foreigners certain places of residence from which they were not allowed to leave. Violations would be severely punished and could even result in expulsion, a fate which many Hebrews apparently suffered. Despite fierce resistance from the Liberals – here too, this party had consciously or unconsciously become an ally of the Jews – the bill had been carried by a majority in Parliament.[23]

Given these various waves of immigration, it is unsurprising that the number of Jews in England had increased considerably from the previous estimated figure [8,000 – 10,000]. The exact size of the population is impossible to determine given the lack of documentation, so we have to rely on rough estimates. Around 1791 we hear from German traveller Gebhard F. A. Wendeborn that around 12,000 Jews lived in England, of which, in his opinion, around 1,000 were in the provinces.[24] The Frenchman Jean-Louis Ferri de Saint Constant lived in England about the same time and gave the much higher figure of over 20,000.[25] With the beginning of emancipation efforts in Parliament in 1830, a reasonable estimate for the Jewish population would be around 25,000 to 30,000 individuals for the whole of Great Britain.[26] It should also be noted, as per Wendeborn, that the Jews living in the provinces in the late 18th century had settled primarily in Falmouth, Plymouth, Portsmouth, Exeter, Chatham and Liverpool (i.e. port towns and cities), and that these provincial Jews were exclusively Ashkenazim, 'for the Portuguese are not fond of leaving the metropolis'.[27]

22 Picciotto, p. 190.
23 Henriques: *Jews*, p. 232; Hyamson: *History*, p. 246; *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 39, pp. 10-24.
24 Wendeborn, Vol. II, pp. 468-9.
25 Rumney, p. 332.
26 Pellatt, p. IV.
27 Wendeborn, Vol. II, p. 469. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from original source.

The Jews Reorganise

The Jews realised that they needed to concentrate all of their forces in the country for the next open attack. The corresponding first moves can already be seen a few years after the defeat of 1753.

On the occasion of George III's accession to the throne in 1760, the elders of the Sephardi community gathered to choose seven delegates from among their ranks who would offer their respects to His Majesty. The king is said to have received these so-called 'Deputies of the Portuguese Nation' very graciously.[28]

The Ashkenazi Jews were not very pleased that this initiative had been taken by their fellow Jews without their being consulted, and later that same year it was agreed that from then onwards both branches of Judaism would work together 'whenever any public affair should occur that may interest the two nations'.[29] This Jewish institution that was to grow from this co-operative pact, the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews [better known as the Board of Deputies of British Jews, or simply the Board of Deputies], came to acquire great significance. It not only looked after the affairs of the Jews in Great Britain, but also watched over the destinies of the Children of Israel throughout the world. Jews from all over the globe contacted the London Committee for help, and as we shall see, not in vain. The Jews do not deny that they used the influence of the British Foreign Office, as well as other means, to their advantage. Picciotto makes the following comment on the 1760-1874 interventions of the Deputies, made on behalf of Jews as far afield as Jamaica, Romania and Damascus:

> In truth, with reference to foreign affairs, they have confined themselves to seeking the intervention of the Foreign Office, which has been granted or declined, according to circumstances. Whether the Deputies might have found other available means of action at hand is a question we need not here discuss. The creation of that institution was for a specific purpose, and the expediency of extending its general scope was a matter for the consideration of its members.[30]

Such a pity that Picciotto does not go into more detail about the other means used – we would have loved to read about such international intriguing from the pen of a well-informed Jew. But one thing is interesting: this statement is fresh confirmation that by this time London was the centre of world Jewry, and, as we shall demonstrate in subsequent volumes, remains so to this day.

Certain difficulties occasionally caused disagreements in this so-called Jewish Parliament, but by the year 1812 one can rightly declare that there was complete unity. Most of better-known Jews of the first half of the 19th century held leading positions in this body. The first Rothschild, whom we shall soon discuss in detail, is also among them. The association developed a diverse range of activities after 1830, when British Jewry was struggling to achieve full emancipation. In Picciotto's words:

---

28 Picciotto, pp. 115-6. Translator's note: For more on this event, as well as the founding and activities of the organisation that this event engendered, see Charles Emanuel's *A Century and a Half of Jewish History. Extracted from the Minute Books of The London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews* (London: Routledge, 1910).

29 Picciotto, pp. 117-8. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from original source.

30 Picciotto, p. 120. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> The Deputies were not idle. They appointed sub-committees, drew up petitions, presented them to various authorities – from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Chancellor of the Exchequer…[31]

So we have a united and well-guided Jewry in England that took up the fight for emancipation. After long, often broken negotiations, an agreement was also reached in the area of cooperation between the three London synagogues in 1824.[32] It may have been the looming decisive struggle that brought about this success.

The Jewish hierarchy also ensured that their most deadly weapon, money, was not lacking, by ensuring that the traditional taxes were raised on congregants' incomes.[33] Finally, in 1794, the Great Synagogue endeavoured to maintain unity by having their members sign a pledge by which they would forfeit £100 if they decided to relinquish their membership.[34]

31 Picciotto, p. 126. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
32 Hyamson: *History*, pp. 250-1.
33 Picciotto, pp. 191-2.
34 Picciotto, p. 224.

A Tidal Wave of Jewish Crime

The Children of Israel of the lower classes traded mainly in old clothes and roamed the streets of London shouting their wares,[35] while others made the province unsafe as peddlers.[36]

The vast majority, however, were active in criminal areas and had gathered in the darkest and filthiest districts of the capital,[37] where the Jews had formed a city entirely unto themselves. 'I began to fancy,' wrote Robert Southey, posing as a Spanish traveller on a visit to this part of the metropolis, 'that I had discovered the ten tribes.'[38] Others expressed themselves in similar terms and spoke with contempt of such a degenerate, uncouth mob.[39] The professor of history and retired Prussian army officer Johann Wilhelm von Archenholz, who lived in England for ten years (1769-1779), had this to say about what he saw while living there:

> …and the children of Israel who are obliged to quit Germany and Holland take refuge in England, where they live by cheating and nocturnal rapine, and if they do not steal themselves, they aid the thief in concealing and vending the stolen goods. Thus, they are so much abhorred by the English that the honesty of the Portuguese cannot obliterate the unfavourable impression which this troop of banditti has made on them.[40]

Another German visitor to London tells us in 1791:

> I believe few burglaries, robberies, and false coinages are committed, in which some of them are not, in one shape or another, concerned. They steal not only themselves, but assist Christian thieves by receiving their stolen goods, and buying them at a very reasonable price. In Duke's-Place, where hardly any but Jews live, during the whole night furnaces are ready to melt the stolen silver and gold as soon as the thieves bring it, that it may be rendered indistinguishable before day-light.[41]

The best and most flawless explanation was given by the Scotsman Patrick Colquhoun, who became famous for the founding of England's first modern police force, among other things. His previous work as both a merchant and magistrate meant that he was good with figures, and in a position to compile official data from primary sources about criminal activity in London and the surrounding area. His work is in no way directed against the Jews, but merely serves to soberly and clearly explain the intolerable conditions in the capital and to set out the evils to the public. At the

35 Rumney, pp. 334-5; Wendeborn, pp. 470-1; Espriella, Vol. III, pp. 150-3.
36 Rumney, p. 336.
37 Goede, Vol. II, p. 116.
38 Espriella, Vol. III, p. 153. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
39 Silliman, Vol. I, p. 133; Wendeborn, p. 470; Rumney, pp. 334-5.
40 Archenholtz, pp. 177-8. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from Rumney, p. 333.
41 Wendeborn, p. 471. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Interestingly, the same charge, of a melting pot always burning in the Jewish quarter, had also been made in pre-1290 England with reference to the coin-clippers. Add Israel Zangwill's 1908 play of the same name, which many see as the Jewish desire to 'melt down' the different ethnic and racial groups in the West, and it becomes clear that the melting pot has become a *leitmotif* that recurs over the centuries of Jewish history.

same time, he proposed remedial measures, which attracted the interest of the king and the government.[42] The Jew Picciotto describes Colquhoun as ‘a large-minded man, desirous of promoting the welfare of Jew as well as of Christian’.[43]

It remains for others to write about the influence of Jews on England's criminality; we shall limit ourselves to a short excerpt from Colquhoun's 1796 *Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis*.

In Colquhoun’s view, the main reason for crime was the widespread use of stolen goods. There were upwards of 3,000 receivers of various kinds of stolen goods in London, with an equal proportion in the rest of the country. Disguised by the beggarly appearance of their junk shops, they sold the stolen valuables from the back rooms. Due to the easy sale of stolen goods of every type, employees and servants were tempted to steal from their employers.[44] Unsustainable conditions also prevailed in the sphere of coinage. The country was flooded with counterfeit money. The London counterfeiters also copied foreign coins, both European and non-European, which were usually sold to Jews for circulation abroad. This brought the name of England into disrepute in foreign countries such as Turkey and India, which had to deal with this fraud. Despite the police's outdated and otherwise inadequate methods of detection, 608 criminals of this type were tried and convicted in one year, yet this was just a fraction of the overall number of such offenders. With this branch of criminality making over £200,000 per year, witnesses were usually bribed or intimidated into silence. The authorities' ability to gather evidence therefore encountered almost insurmountable difficulties.[45]

Colquhoun calculated that the cost to the government and the people of London and its vicinities for all of the petty pilfering, larger systematised theft, robberies, coin counterfeiting and other currency frauds to be some £2,000,000 annually.[46]

The Jews were particularly involved in all of these crimes and even maintained single-horse carts in order to bring the embezzled and stolen items, particularly metals and ship’s articles, from the provinces to London as quickly as possible.[47]

The supplies stolen, including by fraud, from the state's warehouses and dockyards in Portsmouth and Plymouth alone would have to be valued at £500,000 in peacetime and at nearly £1,000,000 in wartime,[48] and for this too the Jews, ‘who are always to be found in abundance wherever the dock-yards are situated’, were the best buyers.[49]

This is followed by detailed observations about the widespread network of counterfeiters and their accomplices, as well as observations about the ubiquity of robbery and murder.[50]

The centre of all of this criminality was London, where the Jews played a major role in coin counterfeiting. The Jews almost had a monopoly in the trade in counterfeit English copper coins and all foreign counterfeit money. Special groups of Jewish youths worked together in the circulation of this worthless money:

---

42 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. IV, p. 859, ff.
43 Picciotto, p. 260. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
44 Colquhoun, pp. 16-9.
45 Colquhoun, pp. 24-30.
46 Colquhoun, pp. 45-7.
47 Colquhoun, p. 52.
48 Colquhoun, p. 70.
49 Colquhoun, p. 77. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
50 Colquhoun, p. 85 ff.

> In this nefarious traffic [of base coin] the lower order of the Jews in London assist the dealers in an eminent degree, particularly the circulation of bad half-pence.
>
> It has not been an unusual thing for several of these dealers to hold a kind of market, every morning, where from forty to fifty Jew boys are regularly supplied with counterfeit half-pence, which they dispose of in the course of the day in different streets and lanes of the metropolis, for *bad shillings*, which they generally purchase, as has already been stated, at 3d. each, in exchange for base copper, always taking care that the person who cries bad shilling shall have a companion near him with the half pence and the unclipt shillings (which are purchased) so as to elude the detection of the Officers of the Police, in the event of being searched.
>
> These Jew boys will generally clear from five to seven shillings a day, by this fraudulent business, which why uniformly spend, during the evening, in riot and debauchery, returning pennyless in the morning to their old trade.
>
> The bad shillings thus purchased by these Jew boys are received in payment by their employers for the bad half-pence, at the rate of four shillings a dozen, and generally re-sold by these employers to *smashers*, at a profit of two shillings a dozen, who speedily re-colour them, and introduce them again into circulation, at their full nominal value.
>
> Thus it is that the frauds upon the public multiply beyond all possible conception, by the devices and criminal manoeuvres already explained, while the innocent tradesman who thus sells his counterfeit shillings to Jew boys at three-pence each, little suspects that it is for the purpose of being returned upon him again at the rate of twelve pence, or 300 per cent profit to the purchasers and utterers [issuers].[51]

Colquhoun then went on to detail the rampant spread of other types of fraud, and to do so created the following criminal category for the Jews who were involved in both theft and the reception of stolen goods:

> *A Class of Cheats of the society of Jews, who are to be found in every street, lane, and alley, in and near the Metropolis, under the pretence of purchasing old clothes, and metals of different sorts*, but whose chief business is to prowl about the houses and stables of men and rank and fortune, for the purpose of holding out temptations to the servants to pilfer and steal small articles, not likely to be missed, which these Jews purchase at about one third of the real value. It is supposed that upwards of two thousand of these depraved people are employed in diurnal journies of this kind, by which, through the medium of bad money and other fraudulent dealings, many of them acquire property, and then become receivers of stolen goods; thereby (while their labour produces no benefit to the State) employing themselves in every mischievous device that can render them nuisances in society.

51 Colquhoun, pp. 118-126. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

Colquhoun then went on to observe the same Jewish *mode of living* that had first been lamented by Edward II:

> It is estimated that there are about twenty thousand Jews in the city of London, besides, perhaps, about five or six thousand more in the great provincial and sea-port towns (where there are at least twenty synagogues, besides six in the metropolis), who exist chiefly by their wits, seeing that the superstitious adherence to a particular *mode of living*, and to their *sabbath*, prevents them from placing out their children as servants, or apprentices, or binding their sons to mechanical employments, or indeed to any useful art, by which they can assist in increasing the national property – in place of which they diminish it by living upon the industry of others, and by establishing a system of mischievous intercourse all over the country, the better to carry on their fraudulent designs in the circulation of base money, the sale of stolen goods, and in the purchase of metals of various kinds, as well as other articles pilfered and stolen in the provincial towns, which they bring to the metropolis to elude detection – and vice versa.

It was unbearable for the English people to endure this wave of predation. In addition to the crimes already described, the Jews evidently had no respect for the English legal system, as they did not shy away from perjury in order to evade justice for themselves and other members of their race:

> Educated in idleness, from their earliest infancy, they acquire every debauched and vicious principle which can fit them for the most complicated arts of fraud and deception, to which they seldom fail to add perjury, whenever it can be of use, in shielding themselves or their associates from the punishment of the law.
>
> From the orange boy, and the retailer of seals, razors, glass, and other wares, in the public streets, to the shop-keeper, dealer in wearing apparel, or in silver and gold, the same principles of action universally prevail.
>
> The itinerants utter [issue] base money to enable them by selling cheap to dispose of their goods, while those that are stationary, with a very few exceptions, receive and purchase, at an under price, whatever is brought them, without asking questions.
>
> The mischiefs which must result from the increase of this depraved race, arising from the natural course of population, is so obvious, that a remedy cannot be too soon applied…[52]

We have nothing to add to these statements because, given his position and impartiality, there could not have been a better authority on this subject than Patrick Colquhoun. That said, we would like to make two comments about Jews in general, which may help to illuminate some of the particularities of Colquhoun's observations.

52 Colquhoun: pp. 166-169. Translator's note: All quotations reproduced verbatim and italicised as per original source.

We have regularly proffered the view that what matters in history is never the overall number of Jews in a country, but rather the extent of their influence through money and other means. This has also been proven in this example.

Their moral depravity has led them to robbery, theft, coin fraud and receiving stolen goods. With a number of around 2,000 people, the Jews represented a large contingent of England's fences. Colquhoun has repeatedly emphasised that fences are the root of all evil. By purchasing the stolen goods, they gave the criminals fresh incentive to commit further crimes. The result of this was a complete breakdown in the relationship of trust between employer and employee, and a complete corruption of morals in public life. This sense of uncertainty was further exacerbated by the circulation of counterfeit money, which again mainly involved Jews. And all of this was brought about, more or less, by some 10,000 to 20,000 Hebrews – a tiny fraction of England's population at the time.

Lastly, another important statement can be made regarding Colquhoun's semi-official report:

Throughout history, Jews have repeatedly excused their people's criminality by stating that they are driven to it by the unbearably cruel treatment from their host nation. Libertarians and overly pious Christians very often confirm this view. Now here once again we have an example that thoroughly refutes this explanation, because as we previously established, even back then the Jews enjoyed every kind of freedom and saw England as the promised land. How then can one excuse the Jews' activities in England around 1800? That they had too much freedom? There is certainly some truth to that!

However, these conditions of pervasive depredation were not limited to the lower classes of the population; the Jewish *mode of living* was also felt everywhere else, especially in financial circles.

The following 'pleasant anecdote' shows how much the Jewish stockbrokers were generally hated. In 1774, the son of a very sick Jewish broker had heard that the Lord Mayor of London had been asking most carefully after the health of his father. This was likely because with the broker's death a new brokerage place would be opened up to the Jews (their places being limited to twelve on the Royal Exchange), and the privilege of a broker's medal would have to be purchased at great expense from the Lord Mayor. However, the Lord Mayor's curiosity begat a rumour on 'Change Alley that he had openly expressed a wish for the ailing broker's death. When the indignant son confronted the Lord Mayor to upbraid him for his unfeeling conduct, the mayor is said to have replied in a way which evidently must have echoed in the public mind over the subsequent decades (this newspaper report dates from 1822):

> The death of the Jew Broker happens very opportunely for the present Lord Mayor, who goes out of office next Friday. The circumstance will remind some of our readers of a pleasant anecdote related of Wilkes. During his mayoralty one of these brokers was seriously ill, and Wilkes was reported to be reckoning on the advantage of the disposal of the probable vacancy. The son of the broker meeting his Lordship, reproached him with wishing his father dead. 'My dear fellow,' said Wilkes, with great promptitude,

> ‘you are completely in error: I would rather that *all* the Jew brokers were dead, than your father.’[53]

Conditions on the stock market became increasingly dire, and bribery of important people in the government continued to progress. People stopped at nothing to gain advantage. Alarming false reports were spread through newspapers, letters from abroad containing false intelligence were touted, and prominent names were used mendaciously in order to manipulate prices on the stock market. Servants and secretaries of public men were bribed for information, while some mistresses and even wives of key figures were turned into spies for members of the stock exchange. Some prominent men even abused their position, making a short-term profit from the false information they promulgated, at the long-term expense of their own reputation, and to the ruin of the men who trusted them. Once an enemy invasion of England was invented, while great men saw rumours of their illness and death spread by those gambling on their life insurance. Truth and honesty on the stock market were outdated concepts.[54]

It was unbelievable how money was made by the army contractors. Here too, bribery and fraud were commonplace:

> These evils were so manifest and manifold, that, after various attempts to pass a measure which should be some check on government, a bill was introduced, by which all contracts were made subject to a species of auction, although the minister was not compelled to accept the lowest offer. During the debates which were held upon the subject, many other facts were elicited, which confirm all the previous remarks, and prove the iniquity with which the money of the country was disposed of. One member possessed a contract producing £30,000 a year more than the legitimate profit. Mr. Alderman Harley made £37,000 too much by another. On a contract for remitting gold, £35,000 was paid more than was necessary. At an earlier period it was discovered that, out of 16,000 tuns of beer contracted and paid for, only 7,000 tuns were delivered. The rum contract was granted at 50 per cent about a remunerating price. The transport service paid 20 per cent too much. Millions were lying for years in the hands of favourite placemen, favourite agents, and favourite contractors, while the country was borrowing at an exorbitant interest; and, after a careful perusal of the evidence, there can be no doubt that the charge of corrupting the House was true; nor was it in the nature of a member of Parliament, in the eighteenth, any more than in the nineteenth century, to possess profitable contracts, the continuation of which depended on war, and yet speak honestly and earnestly for peace.[55]

53 Picciotto, p. 180; Francis, p. 125; *Times*, 6/11/1822 p. 2. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source [*Times*].

54 Francis, p. 165 ff.

55 Francis, p. 179 ff. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Readers may find uncanny resonances with documented practices of recent years.

Jewish Financiers

The money market was increasingly dominated by individual rich Jews. Samson Gideon and Joseph Salvador were succeeded by the brothers Abraham and Benjamin Goldsmid. More than anyone else, it was the entire Goldsmid family, initially the father Aaron, followed by his four sons George (1741-1813), Asher (d. 1822), Benjamin (1755-1808) and Abraham (1756-1810),[56] who were to play a decisive role on the Royal Exchange.

Benjamin Goldsmid had acquired a huge fortune through inheritance and marriage. So it was no wonder that after a short time he had a business turnover that could only be calculated in millions of pounds. It was not long before he and his brother were called to place the government's bonds. In Stamford Hill he had an elegant house, while in Roehampton he had built a lavish palace, the immense splendour of which was described by contemporaries,[57] who compared it to Windsor Castle.[58] The largest and most lavish festivals of the time were celebrated in this manor house. The guests came from the cream of the English nobility, and it was considered a mark of status in high society to frequent Benjamin Goldsmid's house. The famous Pitt was never absent from such occasions, especially as Benjamin was his favourite.

Benjamin was an active philanthropist.[59] On the occasion of one such charity event, the Duke of Kent, father of the future Queen Victoria, presided over the banquet, where it would appear that Benjamin Goldsmid had been sitting to the Duke’s left.[60]

In later years Benjamin suffered from poor health. He committed suicide in 1808.[61] His brother Abraham had at least the same prominence on the Royal Exchange and played a crucial role in the government's financial transactions. At great expense he had a palace built in Morden, which was little inferior in munificence to that of his brother. He held lavish parties there and on one occasion even hosted King George III as his guest.

He did his business together with Sir Thomas Baring, head of the well-known English banking house which carried his name. In 1810 they jointly undertook to raise a government loan of 14 million pounds all by themselves. At the end of the same year, Abraham feared personal financial ruin due to bad speculation and also took his own life. Picciotto describes the public reaction:

> The news of the calamity produced an unparalleled sensation. The loss of the great loan-contractor was regarded as an event of national importance. Expresses were dispatched to the King and to the Prince of Wales. Consols fell in a few minutes from 66½ to 61¾, and omnium from 6½ to 10¾ discount. Jobbers met with anxious faces in Capel Court, and merchants attended before their time in the Exchange. Business was suspended; the

56 Hyamson: *History*, p. 247. Translator’s note: The brothers also had a sister Polly, whose 1801 likeness by James Gilray forms the cover illustration of this volume.
57 Alexander, p. 94 ff.
58 Alexander, p. 100. Translator’s note: For a scathing, satirical commentary on the Goldsmids’ wining and dining of the English elite, and their PR offensive on the English populace, see the 1806 pseudonymous article ‘Jewish Predominance’ in Translator’s Appendix.
59 Alexander, p. 114 ff.
60 Alexander, pp. 110-1.
61 Picciotto, pp. 242-52; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol, VI, p. 30; Francis, pp. 180-4; Margoliouth: *History*, Vol. II, p. 128.

> news of peace or war scarcely caused equal excitement. The public journals teemed with eulogies on a man whose name had been synonymous with charity, with beneficence, with philanthropy. His remains were followed to the grave by weeping and mourning thousands, who, having experienced his generosity and liberality in life, now crowded to honour him in death.

The *Morning Post*, in the meantime, produced a eulogy that would make anyone believe that a great humanitarian messiah had passed. The following extract from its editorial will give the reader an idea of the general tone:

> Never was the stream of human benificence in so full flow so reduced by the death of one man as by that of Mr. Abraham Goldsmid. Never was the departure of a single individual so great a deduction from the comfort of mankind. It is such a one as nothing but the bounty of Heaven can retrieve. But not in an age, and least of all, in an age like this, can we hope to see another instance of a heart so enlarged by universal philanthropy…
>
> As a public man, and a more public spirited and patriotic one than Mr. Abraham Goldsmid never did honour to any age, or country, the loss of him must be long and severely felt. But amidst all his affairs, and much less than he had to attend to would have absorbed the very souls of the worldly, he neglected not for a moment his favourite occupation, the most delightful, the most important to him of all his pursuits, the exercise of his benificence. 'He went about doing good!' How hath he wiped away the tears of the orphan! How hath he caused the widow's heart to leap for joy! So replendent on his countenance was the benevolence of his soul, that in his presence even the sick at heart forgot their sorrows… In favour of him, from every spot of earth on which he was known, will prayers, and tears, and sighs ascend with more than human energy to the throne of the Divine Mercy, to Heaven, earth, and ocean's Lord and Father of the good.[62]

Broadly speaking, a national catastrophe could not have made a deeper impression on the nation, whose fate appeared to hinge on the life of a single rich Jew!

As is alluded to by Picciotto, Abraham, like his brother, was well known for his philanthropic efforts.

On this occasion we would like to briefly address the popular argument about the charity of the Jews, which does not seem to be at all compatible with their opponents' claims that they are hard-hearted and miserly. Anyone who has read through the Hebrew playbook knows that philanthropy is a well-thought-out strategy to achieve overall goals. It is clear to the Jews that every host nation has an aversion to them from the outset, which is exacerbated by the system they have introduced – high finance with all its excesses, bribes, general immorality, etc. The populace, as the object of Jewish exploitation, might look askance at the growth of Jewish power, and at the lavish, brilliant galas and banquets. Therefore the Jews will use tried-and-tested methods to nip the growth

62 Picciotto, pp. 252-4; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV, p. 28; Francis, pp. 184-86; *Times*, 12-13/4/1808; *Morning Post*, 9/10/1810. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original sources.

of popular resentment in the bud, and no method could be more conciliatory than the cloak of charity: sums that seem gigantic to ordinary people being given to causes that guarantee the greatest publicity. And, of course, not everyone will realise that what the Jew gives with one hand, he takes double or triple with the other.*

The opponents of our view declare that such cynical ulterior motives would never inspire Jewish philanthropy. It is usually difficult to prove a person's motives perfectly when, as here, both sides present plausible opposing motivations. In addition to the evidence already presented, our thesis is supported by the fact that such charity donations from Jews would always be publicised as widely as possible. A person who gives just to do good generally avoids making a fuss about it. Finally it would have to be proven that they are naturally kind-hearted, generous and altruistic. This evidence is unlikely to be found, since Judah's actions throughout history, and its principles as laid down in the Talmud and elsewhere, appear to be completely incompatible with disinterested charity towards gentiles.

* Translator's note: One person who most certainly saw this Jewish charity with clear eyes, and wanted to explain the strategy behind it to his fellow countrymen, was the English political commentator William Cobbett (1763-1835), the nineteenth century's foremost radical and anti-Jewish journalist. Among his extensive commentary regarding Judah in England, he made many remarks about Jewish philanthropy, perhaps most notably in the 1806 article 'Jewish Predominance' (see Translator's Appendix), and in comments such as the following:

> The nobility and gentry and clergy seem to me to have entered into a solemn league and covenant to effect their own destruction. It is as clear as daylight, that either they must be overthrown, or that the Jews must be reduced to a moderate bulk. The infernal Jews and usurers are not seen by the people. One pension, or one sinecure, is more a subject of complaint than the whole thirty millions annually swallowed up by the Jews and other devils of *Change-alley*. It is quite amusing to see how quietly the money-dealing villains go and thrust noblemen and gentlemen out of their estates. Aye, and pass for good and generous gentlemen, too, by a liberal distribution of a small part of this money, which this stupid nobility and gentry have enabled them to take out of the pockets of the people. [*Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, Vol. LXXXII, No. 2 (12th October, 1833): pp. 111-112.]

Nathan Mayer Rothschild and Friends

On the subject of the establishment of Jewish power in England before 1830, we must also discuss the richest of the Children of Israel, Nathan Mayer Rothschild. For the scope of this study it will be sufficient to give just a brief overview of his life.

Born in Frankfurt am Main in 1770, Rothschild emigrated to England in 1798. He initially resided in Manchester and moved to London in 1805. At the same time he was naturalised by King George III for his services to the Crown.[63]

Nathan Mayer Rothschild owes his real rise to fame to William I, Landgrave [Prince] and later Elector of Hesse-Cassel, who, with the help of his Nathan's father Mayer Amschel Rothschild, had accumulated vast quantities of wealth by selling his country's sons as mercenary troops for England, particularly in America and India. This 'merchant of human flesh' invested part of his fortune in England, and Rothschild managed it to the complete satisfaction of his employer, who was considered the richest man in Europe at the time. After his escape from Napoleon, the prince became more dependent than ever on Rothschild, which Mayer Amschel exploited to his own advantage.[64]

Rothschild ruthlessly exploited the Napoleonic turmoil in Europe. After the death of the Goldsmid brothers, he took over the role of all-powerful banker on London's Royal Exchange. Only with his help was England able to send subventions to Russia, Prussia, Austria and other states during the Wars of Liberation [Wars of the Sixth Coalition]. His sophisticated system enabled the Duke of Wellington to continue campaigning in Spain. Previously, the entire campaign had often been jeopardised by a lack of money.[65] There is no need for further explanation of the fact that Rothschild thereby secured an unforeseen influence over the English government, which consequently did not hesitate to support his foreign policy interests.[66]

Napoleon knew about Rothschild's efforts against him, and Rothschild was one of those who contributed to the downfall of 'the moneylenders' everlasting enemy'. If Napoleon were to win, the 'the great Debt System which held England and the world in its merciless claws' would be defeated, and therefore, to those who benefitted from this system, no price 'was judged too high to pay for a new European war'. Is it therefore any wonder that, after the fall of Napoleon, the Rothschilds paid for Louis XVIII's expenses from London to Paris, and again on the day of his 'triumphal entry' into the French capital?[67]

What is most interesting here is the role that Nathan Rothschild also played in the preparations for the emancipation of the world's Jews. It must be left to another study to detail his activity in this regard. All that can be said is that, without Rothschild, this development would have been held back for at least another century. He ensured that the privileges already granted to Jews in all countries remained intact and were increased. For this purpose,[68] he ruthlessly exploited the

63 Scherb, p. 60; Wolf, p. 271.
64 Scherb, p. 27; Wolf, p. 262; Corti, p. 53 ff.; McNair Wilson, pp. 255, 287-8.
65 Corti, pp. 128 ff; 139-141; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. X, p. 943 ff. (s.v. Rothschild).
66 Corti, p. 169 ff.
67 McNair Wilson, pp. 353, 364, 379. Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.
68 Corti, p. 138.

growing dependence of the various states around the world on the disbursement of his loans, which amounted to hundreds of millions of marks.[69]

In England, too, Nathan Rothschild was omnipotent in the field of finance, and it is only to the credit of the English people of this time that for some 28 years they managed to withstand the relentless assault for Jewish emancipation that took place under Rothschild's direction [see Volume 6 of this study].

The Jewish side does not deny Rothschild's intervention in this regard. He tirelessly reached out to leading politicians of both sides and tried to put them under his spell. We can see such efforts as early as 1820. In the diary of another well-known Jew, Sir Moses Montefiore, there is an entry dated February 22nd, 1829, which describes how he and Rothschild 'had a long conversation on the subject of liberty for the Jews' with Rothschild saying 'he would shortly go to the Lord Chancellor and consult him on the matter'. The Duke of Wellington was very friendly with both Nathan Rothschild and his son Lionel. When he was once asked by Robert Peel to seek the Rothschilds' support for the upcoming City of London election in favour of the Tories, Wellington regretted that he had to reject such an attempt as hopeless from the outset due to the anti-Jewish attitude of the Tory party.[70]

Rothschild's methods are probably best summarised in the following excerpt from an 1829 book by a pro-Jewish writer, who wrote that:

> M. Rothschild has done more for the emancipation of the Jews, than Mr. O'Connell for that of the Catholics. By the magic power of wealth, he has rendered their obstinate enemies their tributaries; while, by the attractive seduction of gastronomic and musical entertainment, he has completely conquered the aversion of the aristocracy to mix with merchants and Jews; and were the whole Church of England to threaten anathemas against the frequenters of the wealthy financier's mansion, they would certainly prefer corporeal to spiritual comforts, and disregard the threats. Those who are acquainted with the irresistible attractions which good dinners possess for the nobility, will bear me out in this assertion – *Fruges consumere nati*.[71]

Nathan Mayer Rothschild did not live to see the emancipation of the Jews. In 1836 he died in Frankfurt am Main, and his body was taken to London. The Austrian, Russian, Prussian, Neapolitan, and Portuguese ambassadors in London attended his funeral.[72] His estate could not be estimated with certainty. The tax authorities used the figure of £100 million.[73] He was certainly the wealthiest man in the world, and it was said in London that he paid his employees extremely poor wages, as John Francis noted in 1849:

---

69 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. X, p. 495; Wolf, p. 276. Translator's note: The *Jewish Encyclopedia* provides a list of these foreign government loans, which included Brazil and Russia. Wolf relates that Rothschild urged the Austrian Ambassador in London to bring the grievances of Austria's Jews to his government's attention, and in 1819 Rothschild (temporarily) refused to do any business in bills coming from German cities which 'persecuted' Jews.

70 Wolf, p. 276. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.

71 Anichini, pp. 9-10 (footnote). Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. The Latin phrase, from Horace, translates as 'Born to consume the fruits [of the earth]'.

72 Francis, p. 307.

73 Scherb, p. 63.

> His mind was as capable of contracting a loan for millions as of calculating the lowest possible amount on which a clerk could exist. Like too many great merchants whose profits were counted by thousands, he paid his assistants the smallest amount for which he could procure them.[74]

His brother-in-law Moses Montefiore was also one of the rich Jews who saw emancipation as their main goal. Born in 1784, he lived to the rare age of 101. He owed his wealth more or less to his collaboration with Rothschild. He managed to gain the special favour of Princess Victoria of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld, the mother of the future Queen Victoria. He was also on good terms with the latter. When Victoria ascended the throne in 1837, she raised Montefiore to the knighthood [the same year that he was elected Sheriff of the City of London], and in 1846 she made him a baronet for his humanitarian services on behalf of Jews all over the world. The year prior to his baronetcy he was also named High Sheriff of Kent, the oldest secular office under the Crown, dating back to Anglo-Saxon England. It is obvious that his court and government connections served him well for his advocacy work.

In our list of Jewish financiers we cannot omit Abraham Israel Ricardo, the commissioned stockbroker for the Bevis Marks Synagogue. It is almost redundant to mention that he likewise possessed a large fortune. One of his sons arguably went on to become an even greater name in England. This son was David Ricardo, the financier who gained a reputation as a political economist after converting to Unitarianism. At his death in 1823 he was Whig [liberal] Member of Parliament for the borough of Portarlington with an estimated fortune of £700,000.[75]

Finally, we would like to mention a Jew named Menasseh Lopez, who was born in Jamaica in 1755 and made his fortune there before moving to England. Picciotto describes his conversion to Christianity in the following way:

> The change in the theological opinions of Mordecai and of Menasseh Lopez happened by a singular coincidence to manifest itself at the time of a general election, and the fact was immediately followed by the return of Menasseh as member for New Romney.

In 1805 he was created a baronet. In the next election, Sir Menasseh secured a seat for Barnstaple, the borough for which he was again re-elected in 1818. At this point we shall let Picciotto resume the tale:

> Curious to say, we find that an attorney, named Dance, who had insulted Sir Menasseh Lopez, incorrectly described as ‘a Jew baronet’, was condemned to twelve months imprisonment, and to be struck off the rolls. On the 18th March 1819, the ‘Jew baronet’ was found guilty at the Exeter Assize of having bribed the electors of the borough of Grampound to secure his election, and sentence was deferred. On the 13th November he was again prosecuted for a similar offence, and convicted, and he received sentence in

74 Francis, p. 297. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source [1855 edition]. For more on the life and times of Nathan Rothschild, see Martin (chapter XVI) and Bermant (chapter IV).

75 Picciotto, pp. 220-1.

> the Court of the Queen's Bench. He was condemned for the first offence to be imprisoned for twenty-one months in Exeter Jail, and to pay to the King a fine of £10,000, and for the second infraction of the law, which had been committed in Devonshire, he was sentenced to a further confinement of three months and another fine of £2000. Notwithstanding these untoward circumstances, Sir Menasseh Massey Lopez was once more returned to Parliament, and this time he was chosen as a fit representative for the immaculate borough of Westbury.

His criminal record evidently did not prevent him from holding other high civil service positions as, at the time of his death in 1831, he was found to be fulfilling the functions of recorder at Westbury, as well as being a magistrate for two counties.

He left no descendants, which meant that his title and property worth over £800,000 was inherited by his nephew, Ralph Franco, who then became Sir Ralph Lopes after making a slight [Anglicising] alteration to his uncle's surname. Ralph's son, Sir Massey Lopes, 3rd Baronet, became a Conservative politician and, under the prime ministership of his fellow Sephardi Benjamin Disraeli, was even promoted to the office of First Lord of the Admiralty.[76]

This description may suffice for now, for it is impossible to mention all the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Jews who were rich and influential. We consciously make no distinction between baptised and unbaptised Jews, since in our opinion there is no such distinction. On the contrary, the former were probably even more dangerous at this time than the latter, since even before the general emancipation they were able to slip into all sorts of powerful positions and thus serve the Jewish cause. As Picciotto admits, Jewish emancipation was ultimately achieved 'by a few solitary individuals who bore the brunt of the battle – and conquered'.[77]

76 Picciotto, pp. 304-6. Translator's note: Both quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.
77 Picciotto, p. 126. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from original source.

The Power of Propaganda

Already at the end of the 18th century it was noticed that forces were emerging to transform the perceptions of the masses, which is best shown by the numerous books in favour of the Jews that appeared around this time. It is striking that no important book which contains the opposing viewpoint has been found.

We would like to mention just a few of the various authors found in the public sphere around this time. The earliest appears to be someone who wrote under the pseudonym J. D. I., who did a lot for the Jewish cause around 1795. Other individuals followed with public letters and pamphlets, all of them agreeing that the Jews had been terribly wronged throughout history, a situation which continued to that day.[78]

A few years later, a well-known playwright, Richard Cumberland (1732-1811), took their side with his comedy, *The Jew*.[79] His sympathetic Jewish characters, not least of them a Jewish hero, perhaps contributed most out of all the general propaganda to so-called polite society coming to a favourable opinion about the Jewish race. Cumberland's *The Jew* achieved great success. It was performed for the first time on May 8th, 1794 at the Drury Lane Theatre and was soon performed throughout England, according to contemporary reports. It was even staged in America, France and Germany, where it appeared in German translation as early as 1798.[80] The audience was moved to tears by the sentimentality of the play, which is incomprehensible to us today.[81] The plot is briefly as follows: A rich, respected English merchant's son marries a Jewish woman – to the displeasure of both families. The resulting conflicts are resolved by the benevolent moneylender Sheva, who, in Cumberland's view, represents the archetype of the true Jew. Above all, he was concerned with portraying a Jew of generous and honourable character, in contrast to the Shylock of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*. A typical excerpt of the play proves that the message was anything but subtle:

> CHARLES enters with SHEVA.
>
> *Charles*: This is the man. My benefactor; your's Eliza; Frederic's; your's dear mother! all mankind's: The widow's friend, the orphan's father, the poor man's protector, the universal philanthropist.
>
> *Sheva*: Hush, hush! You make me hide my face. [*Covers his face with his hands.*]
>
> Charles: Ah, Sir, 'tis now too late to cover your good deeds: You have long mask'd your charities beneath this humble seeming, and shrunk back from actions princes might have gloried in: You must now face the world, and transfer the blush from your own cheeks to their's, whom prejudice has taught to scorn you. For your single sake we must reform our hearts, and inspire them with candor towards your whole nation.
>
> Sheva: Enough, enough! More than enough – I pray you spare me: I am not used to hear the voice of praise, and it oppresses me: I shou'd not know myself, if you were to describe me; I have a register within, in which these merits are not noted. Simply I am

78 Picciotto, pp. 236-7.
79 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. V, p. 290 ff.
80 For the German version, see the translation *Der Jude* by Dengel.
81 Williams, p. 231.

> an honest man, no more; fair in my dealings, as my good patron here, I hope, can witness…[82]

Newspaper and magazine critics could not praise this piece enough, while printed editions of the play were continually selling out, as we can see from the fact that the printed version was already in its seventh edition by 1801.[83]

Other publications also sought to clear the Hebrews of their character flaws, with the writing of Jewish surgeon and apothecary Joshua van Oven particularly standing out in this regard. In *Letters on the Present State of the Jewish Poor in the Metropolis* (1802), he demanded that steps be taken to improve the situation, particularly on the basis of Colquhoun's official crime report. He did not deny the incredibly dire reality of Jewish criminality, but did not attribute it to the depravity of the Jews, instead blaming their unfavourable economic situation. In his view, the Jewish poor should not only be asked to undertake honourable professions, but should also be given practical help to do so.[84]

The suggestions for reform made by van Oven in the aforementioned pamphlet were deemed unacceptable by the Jewish printer Levy Alexander, in the response pamphlet that he printed shortly after van Oven's tract appeared.[85] Furthermore, the same author also strongly objected to the way the situation of Jewish criminality had been presented by Colquhoun. While the facts Colquhoun stated may have been true, Alexander argued that they should have been presented in a way that was not as offensive.[86]

Among the pro-Jewish writers one should not forget Thomas Witherby, who advocated for a change in popular sentiment regarding the Jews through his various treatises. In his main work, *An Attempt to Remove Prejudices Concerning the Jewish Nation* (1804), which contains over 500 pages of small print, he objects, among other things, to the common English saying: 'The fellow is a perfect Jew.' This was understood to mean a person who always sought to gain the greatest possible benefit for himself, even if it meant exploiting the difficulties of others. Shakespeare may also have shown such 'popular and vulgar prejudice', Witherby argued, but it was really time to do away with such outdated concepts. All persecutions of Jews, including of those in England, were unjustified.[87] The crimes with which the Jews were charged 'should be imputed to that general odium under which they then had the misery to live' i.e. they were driven to commit crimes by the Christians.[88]

---

82 Cumberland, p. 47 (Act V, Scene 2). Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

83 Williams, pp. 232-33. Translator's note: For examples of the occasional contemporary critics who found this portrayal of a wealthy Jewish financier (who secretly provides disinterested financial assistance to two young star-crossed Christian lovers and who leaves his fortune to an indigent Christian) mawkish and implausible, see p. 234 of Williams and the article 'Jewish Predominance' [Translator's Appendix]. Note also that when Cumberland staged a similar play fourteen years later in 1808 called *The Jew of Mogadore*, it was universally panned and had to close down after three or four nights [Schroeter, p. 57, in Translator's Bibliography].

84 Van Oven, p. 4 ff., 16. Translator's note: Van Oven was also a reformer, who worked to realise the reforms he had written about, and while his great Jewish welfare scheme (planned with Colquhoun) failed due to opposition, he was instrumental in founding the Jews' Free School, the Jews' Hospital in Mile End, as well as several Jewish schools and charities in Liverpool. See *Jewish Encyclopedia* Vol. 12, pp. 400-1 (s.v. VAN OVEN, JOSHUA), Picciotto, pp. 259-63.

85 Alexander: *Answer*, p. 30 ff.

86 Alexander: *Answer*, esp. p. 34 ff. Translator's note: This typically Jewish strategy of using the tone argument, i.e. of attacking a message's style to deflect from its content, will doubtless be familiar to modern readers.

87 Witherby, p. 1 ff. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source (pp. 1-2).

88 Witherby, p. 19. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source. Perceptive readers may rightly speculate whether this was an early prototype of the now-common liberal/Jewish strategy of always finding a way to blame the White (i.e. European Christian) male for the crimes and failures of every other group.

Furthermore, in Great Britain they would have been favourably influenced by the character of the English.[89] Given this latter argument, we would therefore have been interested to see the author try to explain away the almost intolerable level of Jewish criminal activity at that time.

A certain William Hamilton Reid was also a supporter of the Jewish cause. He too emphasised that the prejudices against them needed to be eliminated, especially since in England they had recently become much more assimilated with the manners and customs of the country.[90]

Immediately before the emancipation struggles began, a work was published addressed to the Duke of Wellington which advocated general Jewish emancipation. The Jews not only had a right to live and enjoy, 'in common with the rest of mankind, all the advantages which society admits of', but they are 'moreover particularly distinguished by the favour of Heaven for an uninterrupted supremacy in wealth and power, and for the homage and submission which the highest authorities on earth zealously pay them'. According to the will of God, 'the Jews should not only live, but prosper, and be protected, like the rest of human kind'.[91] The author asked why people spurned Jews for their cold rapacity, when the same thing could be said of the English:

> But who is not equally fond of money in England, where, infinitely more than in any other part of the world, every thing can be obtained by the help of money?

In addition, there was also be no-one more immoral than England's 'triumphant aristocrats', who were known to be involved in 'adultery, gambling, and (I tremble in writing it), incest, and unnatural crime', accusations were not made against the Jews.[92] The author's heart bled when he thought of 'the cruelties inflicted by the followers of the doctrines of Christianity upon the Jews; persecutions which must have nearly exhausted the fountain of divine mercy'.[93]

The author then points out the injustice of granting emancipation to Catholics but not to Jews, as he asks rhetorically:

> …what can refrain the Constitutional King of Protestant England, who has lately signed a family compact with the sectarians of the execrated Rome, to grant the same boon to the followers of the oldest religion on record, who, by the exclusive possession of wealth, rule the moral destinies of the world?[94]

This situation was all the more reprehensible given that the Jews had already been emancipated in France and many parts of Germany.[95]

---

89 Witherby, p. 37 ff.
90 Reid, esp. Introduction, p. 5.
91 Anichini, pp. 5-6. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.
92 Anichini, pp. 24-27. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source. In the original text, the author has asterisked the word 'incest', as he has added a footnote in which he tells of a still-living English nobleman who had a sexual relationship with his own sister, whom he implies killed the fruit of the union to evade discovery. For a discussion of Jews and incest, see Chapter IX of Ryssen [in Translator's Bibliography].
93 Anichini, p. 44. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from original source.
94 Anichini, p. 10. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
95 Anichini, pp. 18, 23.

In the same year [1829], a book was published by the English glassmaker Apsley Pellatt which also strongly advocated emancipation. His main concern was that the Jews be granted full freedom of the City of London.[96]

Publications specifically about Jewish emancipation seldom appeared before 1829. The propaganda of this earlier period only said generally favourable things about the Hebrews, without mentioning the actual purpose of the propaganda, which was to prepare the public mind for later emancipation efforts. We therefore certainly believe Picciotto when he talked of 'the awakened interest and sympathy which were beginning to be felt by thoughtful Englishmen and English women for a long persecuted race.'[97] We are also not surprised that even princes insisted on attending Jewish services, as Picciotto recounts:

> In April 1809 the Synagogue in Duke's Place experienced the unusual honour of receiving a state visit from several princes of the blood. Abraham Goldsmid attended personally at a meeting of the Synagogue on the 3rd of April, to give notice that the Duke of Cumberland, the Duke of Sussex, and the Duke of Cambridge, intended to assist at a Friday evening service. The Duke of Sussex, it is well known, always displayed much friendship and sympathy for the Jews. On this occasion pompous preparations were made for the reception of these distinguished guests. The Wardens of the day were Messrs. Asher Goldsmid, Joseph Cohen, and Moses Samuel. The notice was short, for the visit occurred on Friday evening, the 14th April. The path of the Royal Dukes from their carriages to the entrance of the Synagogue was strewn with flowers; and their advent was hailed with the usual Prayer for the Royal Family – 'He who giveth salvation unto kings' – intoned by a well-drilled choir. Some verses, written, we believe, by the late Michael Josephs, were sung; and a few copies printed on silk were distributed to a favoured number. Altogether the celebration is said to have met in the highest degree the approbation of the princely sons of George III; and the visit of the Royal Dukes still forms a tradition of glory among the older members of the Great Synagogue.[98]

We will soon see that this was not just inspired by idle curiosity, but a real interest in the Jews. Finally, the following 1808 observation of Robert Southey, posing as Spanish traveller Manuel Alvarez Espriella, appears to accurately judge the mood of the nation:

> During the last reign an attempt was made to naturalize them, in a body; and the measure would have been effected had it not been for the indignant outcry of the people, who very properly regarded it as an act of defiance, or at least of opposition, to the express language of prophecy. But this feeling has abated, and were the attempt to be renewed it would meet with little opposition.[99]

96 Pellatt, pp. 5, 8, 23-27 and *passim*.
97 Picciotto, p. 234. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
98 Picciotto, pp. 267-8. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
99 Espriella, Vol III, pp. 143-4. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Southey also tells the story [p. 145] of how in earlier years a farce called *The Jew Boy* was shut down by Jewish protests, after the Jews 'assembled in great numbers and actually damned the piece'. This leads the author to conclude: 'This single fact is sufficient to prove that the liberty which they enjoy is unbounded.'

As a result, we are not surprised that some of the press had also changed significantly over the intervening decades. At the beginning of the 19th century the press published numerous essays and articles that dealt sympathetically with all questions concerning Jews.[100] It happened so often that one can hardly believe that the public participated spontaneously and one cannot shake the thought that there was a well-directed power behind this trend. It is impossible to list the numerous articles in the various newspapers, and so the mere statement of this fact should suffice.*

*Translator's note: Aldag was doubtless correct in his assertion of a well-directed power behind the press. Below are excerpts from William Cobbett, who appears to have been the sole journalist prepared to critique the growth of Jewish power in early 19th-century England. Given that Cobbett was the 'almost unique' popular writer who had an anti-Jewish stance at this time [Felsenstein, pp. 215-6, 237], and a man who used his own newspaper as a vehicle for his views, one can see why Aldag has apparently overlooked him in his survey of the contemporary literature. *See also Translator's Appendix.*

> … and of course, the Jew newspapers have told a lie upon Colonel Clithero. It is curious enough, that the Jew Levi, actually took an opportunity at the meeting at Bow-street on the Thursday, to *praise* the *Old Times* and the *Morning Herald*, calling them respectable papers. I have often said, that the London press, is in great part *owned by the Jews*. There was a Jew of the name of King, who owned in part or in whole, two or three of the newspapers; and I am quite satisfied that the far greater part of them are now *in the pay* of the Jews, at any rate.
>
> [*Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (October 25th, 1823): p. 214.]

> God forbid, that I should not believe, that a vast majority of this nation is yet undebased: but as far as the press can go; as far as it has influence, this verily is, the basest nation, that ever was in the world. Nine tenths of the press, which ought to be the guardian of public morals, which ought to be the support of public spirit, which ought to prevent the nation from being cheated or deluded. Nine tenths of this press, or at least a very large part of it, is absolutely in the pay of the Jews. Not a stipend received from them, perhaps; not, perhaps, so much money down upon the counter, generally speaking; but in one way or other, the tool of the Jews for pecuniary reward.
>
> […]
>
> Every nation, that has fostered the Jews, has become miserable in proportion to their numbers and influence. Here, they have had an influence, and have influence, such as fills one with indignation to think of; and as the system becomes more and more embarrassed, their influence becomes greater and greater – Base press of London is their tool; no man who wishes to utter a word against them, can get that word in a newspaper in London.
>
> [*Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, Vol. 65, No. 1 (January 5th, 1828): pp. 22-23.]

100 Picciotto, p. 278.

Freemasonry

We have tried to show the various forces that consciously or unconsciously worked towards Jewish emancipation. In this context we must also briefly touch upon the question of the involvement of Freemasonry. We have already stated our wish to discuss this matter only with the greatest caution, in order to pre-empt any accusation of a lack of solid, verifiable evidence for our claims.

Although the Freemasons have always known how to cover their tracks, it is no longer a secret that Freemasons were in close contact with the Jews, and that it was Freemasonry that largely helped pave the way for Jews to embark on their emancipation struggle. The nobility and the other ruling classes of the English nation, in which the Hebrews had long established a strong foothold through business and private relationships, were brought together in the lodges. So what would have been more a logical step than to admit their Jewish brethren according to the Masonic principle of religious tolerance, the first step on the path to social equality which would end in their complete emancipation? We soon find numerous Jews in the lodges, among whom the Mendez, Montefiores and Rothschilds are not absent. In this way Jewish masons were able to work from within for the cause of their fellow Jews, being able to penetrate further and further into state life with the help of their Masonic brothers in leading English circles, and were thus able to conquer one position after another. And then there is the following anecdote that likewise seems to confirm that the Freemasons, in line with their generally pro-Jewish outlook, stood up for the Hebrews:

The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, which shall be discussed later in more detail, was on the verge of bankruptcy and, to deal with this crisis, what was probably the Society's most important meeting since its founding was held on March 29th, 1840, 'at Free-Masons Tavern'. It is up to the reader to decide whether this choice of location should be interpreted as coincidental or as an expression of the Society's close cooperation with the Freemasons. It did not stop at this one meeting at Free-Masons Tavern, as it was decreed that 'the General Committee shall meet once a month at the Free-Masons Hall, and that His Royal Highness the Patron, and the Vice-Presidents, be requested to attend it…'.[101]

101 Norris, p. 96 (footnote). Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source. The (ostensible) argument for these meeting places may have been that, as the Society's members were drawn from both the Church of England and Nonconformism, Free-Masons Tavern and the Free-Masons Hall could be deemed 'neutral' venues.

Napoleon and the Jews

In addition to internal English forces, there were also foreign political events that gave the Jewish emancipation movement a significant boost: the French Revolution and Napoleon's pro-Jewish measures.[102]

The cries of distress from the rural population in almost all the eastern provinces of what was then France [roughly corresponding to the regions of Alsace and Lorraine] became more and more urgent as the Hebrews sucked them dry. Napoleon, who could not ignore this appeal for help, intervened.[103]

In 1806 he summoned to Paris an assembly of 111 Jewish notables (which later became the Great Sanhedrin), from whom he demanded a clear explanation on certain questions put to them. Among other things, he demanded assurances from them that their fellow Jews would behave patriotically and fraternally towards the local population from that point onwards and would refrain from any kind of usury.[104]

Napoleon's plan was an attempt to reform the entire life of the Jews, who, in his view, had to assimilate themselves to the views and customs of modern Europe. He considered it essential that they renounce the Halakha [the traditional Jewish law code] and the teachings that had come down to them through the Talmud and other books, in view of the fundamental change in overall social conditions that had recently occurred, just as he also held their reckless accumulation of money to be significantly disadvantageous to French society. When the Great Sanhedrin accepted his proposals for reformation, he assured the Jews of a complete emancipation.

We cannot go into detail here about this valiant attempt by Napoleon, but it is obvious to anyone familiar with the Jewish character that his efforts, like those of the noble King Edward I of England before him, would naturally be doomed to failure. The result of his action was, however, that all over the world, reference was made to the outcome of the events in France – Jewish emancipation – with the Jews in different countries seeking the same right with varying levels of clamour, using Napoleon as their precedent. As is to be expected, these events also had their repercussions in England.

In connection with this, we would like to briefly touch on the question that is so often asked as to why the Jews of England, under the leadership of Rothschild, fought Napoleon with all their might.

This fact is very often cited as evidence of the English Jews' patriotism, given that they saw Napoleon as an enemy of England despite his pro-Jewish policies.

People who do not sufficiently understand the Jewish Question are inclined to explain these events in England with the claim, so often made by the Jews, that they were due to the fact that the Jews do not all work in lockstep, and often have major disagreements with each other. However,

---

102 Picciotto, p. 234.

103 Reid p. 1 ff.

104 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. XI, pp. 46-8 (s. v. SANHEDRIN, FRENCH), also Vol. IX, pp. 167-8 (s.v. NAPOLEON BONAPARTE). Translator's note: Additional information taken from *Esau's Tears* pp. 48-50 [see Translator's Bibliography]; note that the Great Sanhedrin is also known by the closer translation Grand Sanhedrin in English-language historiography. Napoleon also instituted a debt holiday for the peasants. From Margolis and Marx's *A History of the Jewish People*, p. 613: '…in a rescript dated May 30, 1806, Napoleon suspended for a year the payment of all debts held by Jews against agriculturists in the eastern departments.'

there is in fact no such disunity because the Children of Israel have always been united on major issues of global politics. But even putting this argument to one side for a moment, there are better ways to explain the behaviour of the Jews in England.

As is well known, Rothschild founded his banking house largely with the blood money of the infamous Prince of Hesse-Cassel. His client was the creditor of almost all the princes who fought against Napoleon. Napoleon, who knew of Rothschild's activities against him, was a constant threat to Rothschild's extensive business on the continent. As a result, Rothschild could not endure such a constant threat either to his personal interests or to the general emancipation plans closely related to them.

But even without this interpretation of events, the following explanation is hard to refute.

What did Napoleon demand from the Jews in return for emancipation? Nothing more and nothing less than an improvement in their behaviour towards the host population by abolishing their so-called divine and, for the most part, completely immoral laws. What did that mean? Above all, it meant that Napoleon had undoubtedly made the decision that under no circumstance would he permit the people's wealth to be sucked dry by usury and that Jews would only be tolerated in the country if they behaved decently. This was a clear indication from a powerful ruler that only he had the right to determine the laws which governed the life and wellbeing of his people. There was no doubt in the minds of the Hebrews that Napoleon would prevail in this regard, and this was unacceptable to them.

But Napoleon went further. He had recognised that the principles of the Jews were incompatible with those of a healthy nation and that a root-and-branch reformation of Judaism was therefore necessary. In doing so, he intervened in the Jews' own lives. No matter how corrupt their values may be from our point of view, they have been sacred to the Jews for centuries and, above all, a means to an end: world domination.

So we believe that it was the Jewish Orthodox circles that not only rejected Napoleon's efforts but, given their religious beliefs, *had* to reject them. One can easily see this from certain statements made by Jewish individuals. In 1928, a very well-known Jew named Mr. Levy from Florida gave a public speech which explained how the Sanhedrin of France had been wrong in acceding to Napoleon's demand for secularisation. He detailed at length how the decision was erroneous and 'destitute of the Holy Spirit' as 'the design of the law [Halakha] was to create a field of action in every occurrence of life, for the exercise of faith in the word of God; and that to separate spiritual concerns from temporal duties, was at complete variance with the object of revelation, and tended to counteract the purposes of God'.[105]

We hear this very often today. In matters where man falls short, the Holy Spirit and the will of God must be called upon for divine assistance. But no one disputes that Rothschild was also an Orthodox Jew, and so this too could also be another explanation as to why he opposed Napoleon.

Furthermore, some of the Jews did not entirely trust Napoleon's efforts. They feared that at a later date he would use all his power to put them back in their original place. That this fear may have been justified can be seen from a remark made by Napoleon regarding the great support his troops received from the Polish Jews during his war against Prussia (1806-7). When he was told about it, he reportedly said with a laugh: 'The Sanhedrin is at least useful to me.' The Jews' mistrust is further seen in the comment made by the well-known Jew David Friedländer and his friends in

105 Thrush, pp. 99-104. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (p. 104).

Berlin, which described Napoleon's convocation of the Sanhedrin as simply 'a spectacle that Napoleon offered to the Parisians'.[106]

Be that as it may, we are convinced that Napoleon's endeavours stood in the way of the power-political considerations of international Jewry under Rothschild leadership. Then it was Napoleon, today it is Hitler.

106 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. XI, pp. 46-8 (s.v. SANHEDRIN, FRENCH). Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source. While there may have been genuine Jewish support for Napoleon on the continent, other Jewish support was purely profit-driven, as contemporary army complaints about Jewish profiteering indicate (*Revolution and Evolution*, p. 129; *The Jewish Economic Elite*, pp. 138-9). Even Jewish historians Margolis and Marx admit that 'Napoleon was little edified by the spectacle of small Jewish traders following his armies to buy up the soldiers' loot' (*A History of the Jewish People*, p. 612). See Translator's Bibliography for all sources.

The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews

In 1808 the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews was founded.[107] A certain Mr. Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey was the driving force. He was a Jew who had been born in Germany and who had converted to Christianity a few years before.[108] While the London Society's first report of May 23rd, 1809 showed modest successes, the picture had already improved considerably according to the second report of December 27th, 1809.[109] The first thing one notices is that the board was largely made up of members of the highest nobility. We find, among others, the Earl of Crawford and Lindsay, Lord Robert Seymour and Lord Calthorpe, but also the names of baptised Jews. In the meantime, Mr. Frey was giving sermons twice a week in a chapel and had had numerous tracts printed.

The second report announced that a fund was soon to be set up that would provide money to Jews who intended to marry English women.[110] They proudly declared that they had already raised £2,280 to this end. Among the donors was the Duke of Gloucester with £20.[111]

What is striking is that no president had yet been named. Apparently they wanted to fill this position with a particularly high-ranking personage. Efforts were made in vain to persuade the Archbishop of Canterbury.[112]

The next report listed other members of the nobility on the board and reported on the great successes throughout England. Branches were being set up in larger cities everywhere, and by the beginning of June there would be around 60 of them.[113] The amount of the endowments was also described as encouraging. In one year around £6,000 had been raised.[114] The donors were mainly from aristocratic circles and apparently baptised Jews who had typical English Jewish names.[115]

The activity of this organisation could be felt not only in the places where it had branches but reached into every remote corner of England. The land was inundated with a flood of tracts, distributed gratis, about the customs and traditions of the Jews with a view to a better understanding of them.[116] The fourth report appeared on May 21st, 1812. It noted with satisfaction the growth of the movement, which was already demonstrated by the establishment of a total of one hundred branches in England.[117] The postal service was thanked for sending pamphlets free of charge.[118]

---

107 Halstead, p. 18. Translator's note: However, Gidney in his official *History of the London Society* states that it was founded in 1809. [See Translator's Bibliography].
108 Norris, pp. 5, 22; Goakman, p. 5.
109 *First Report*, pp. 10-20.
110 *Second Report*, p. 12.
111 *Second Report*, pp. 45, 60.
112 Norris, p. 36. Translator's note: Norris reports that the Society still turned this rejection to their advantage, as it had made sure to report their solicitation to the Archbishop in the press, thereby linking his name with the London Society in the public mind. This ambitious desire [chutzpah?] to capture the very biggest names from the outset is also seen in the fact that no less than the Prince Regent, afterward George IV., was invited to become the first Patron of the Society. This invitation not being accepted, the Society eventually had to settle for the Duke of Kent [Gidney p. 37]. As the organisation grew however, they did get subsequent Archbishops of Canterbury on board, in trustee and patron roles. Indeed, as Gidney's *History* makes clear, the London Society became a veritable *Who's Who* of English high society.
113 *Third Report*, p. 69 ff.
114 *Third Report*, p. 102.
115 *Third Report*, pp. 125-182.
116 Norris, pp. 44-5.
117 *Fourth Report*, p. 25 ff.
118 *Fourth Report*, p. 134.

Donations had increased still further.[119] The list concerned shows around 2,800 donors, most of whom belonged to the aforementioned circles. The number of lectures on topics related to Jews had increased.[120]

The company celebrated one of its greatest triumphs in 1813. The Duke of Kent, father of the future Queen Victoria, was chosen as president.[121] The board included a number of well-known names from the nobility. In addition to those already mentioned, we also see the Duke of Devonshire, Viscount Northland, and the Earls of Stamford, Grosvenor, and Egmont, to name just a few. Even the highest clergy believed that they could no longer remain uninvolved. So we find the Bishop of Cloyne and the Dean of Wells on the board. There were also a handful of MPs, and even the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not want to be missing from this illustrious company.

A magazine, *The Jewish Repository*, was published in January 1813, which, in addition to articles on the history of the Jews since the destruction of Jerusalem, also published articles on all other questions that served to promote understanding. As soon as the magazine came out, 800 copies were sold every month[122] and a further large number distributed free of charge.[123] The fifth report shows that the donor list was just as long. In addition to the people already mentioned, it contained the highest members of the clergy. The Bishop of Durham alone donated £50.[124]

At the same time, the foundation stone of 'Palestine Place', the London Society's own chapel for Christian Jews, was laid. Princes and around 1,000 members of the upper circles of British society were present. The whole thing was turned into a first-rate event.[125]

However that same year, 1813, brought disaster: the Society's 'first and principal organ', the aforementioned Mr. Frey, was convicted of very immoral acts, 'as foul a charge upon his *moral* character as could possibly be preferred', that necessitated his immediate departure to America.[126]

Nevertheless, the Society overcame this embarrassing event. Apart from a temporary financial difficulty that was quickly resolved, the organisation continued to extend its operations. Procuring funds from the 'little people' was also constant, with particularly good results being seen among the well-meaning Christian women who ran the 'ladies' auxiliary societies' and 'penny societies'. Here, the author hints at there being a deliberate strategy to use emotional manipulation and false representation to convince members of the gentler sex to part with their money:

> Collections after sermons were made, both in churches and conventicles, wherever admission into the pulpit could be gained; and auxiliary and penny societies spread

119 *Fourth Report*, pp. 61-132.

120 Norris, p. 48. Translator's note: From page 5 of the *Fourth Report*: 'The Westminster Committee have also arranged a Lecture to Christians, on subjects relative to the Jews, to be preached at various places of worship at the west end of the town.'

121 Halstead, p. 21.

122 *Fifth Report*, pp. 9-10.

123 *Fifth Report*, p. 14.

124 *Fifth Report*, pp. 23-75.

125 Norris, pp. 67-76. Translator's note: Gidney gives an extensive description of the event, stating that 20,000 spectators were present to witness the Duke of Kent laying the foundation stone. Interestingly, Gidney describes Palestine Place, which opened in 1814, as 'the first place of worship set apart in England for Christian Jews' (p. 41), which indicates that the London Society appears to have been diametrically opposed to the spirit of Galatians 3:28.

126 Norris, pp. 63-66, 146 ff; Goakman, pp. 58-59. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (Norris, pp. 64-5). It is unclear what the charge was, although Norris tell us that it was '*publicly* brought against him *to his face*, and supported by the evidence of *five witnesses*, who all deposed that they had within the last half-hour detected him in the commission of the alleged delinquency'.

> themselves with an accelerated rapidity. But the grand financial exploit of this period was directed at the ladies, to bring them under contribution distinctly from the male part of our population. For which purpose, a contrast between their own condition and that of the *vilest Jewish prostitutes*, was obtruded upon their notice, purporting to be an appeal to them in behalf of poor Jewesses, from one of their own sex, and framed with studious adaptation to the *weaknesses* of the female character; whilst, at the same time, the Bible Society's manoeuvre of heading their circulars with influential names, taken *without their owner's consent*, was largely resorted to. The result was, that in the three years from 1813 to 1815, included in the present period, the Society drew from the well-intentioned and spurious benevolence of the nation, a sum exceeding £31,000.[127]

In 1828 there even appears to have been at least one joint meeting of Christians and Jews in order to bring the two together by discussing the religious questions which concerned them.[128]

It has not been possible to clearly ascertain the success that was achieved in terms of conversion. In the first 16 years of the London Society's existence, £135,000 is said to have been spent, but the total number of converts is not stated. The result was probably very pitiful, because according to Picciotto, £14,000 of donations were received in 1828, yet only two adult conversions to Christianity were recorded, along with eighteen to twenty children.[129] This would equate to a sum of around £700 for the conversion of a single person. In reality the overall average cost would probably have been even higher, but even considering the figure given it is shameful to think how much good such an amount could have done for the English people, whose poor then lived in almost greater misery than they do today. There was therefore no lack of voices that recommended the money be better spent on Christian charity, including from the Jews themselves. As one Jewish man, Tobias Goodman, wrote:

> I come now to consider the more particular means by which the London Society 'humbly hope to accomplish this most desirable object'; they are specified as follows, page 4 'to establish a School, that they may be able to receive children wholly from their parents, and bestow upon them education, board, and clothing.' Could this event be accomplished, I think it would be difficult to find a parallel, where benevolence (if it can be so considered) is so ill applied. Are there no Christian families for whom such an establishment would be more prudent? Are there no children among your brethren, whose unfortunate state in Society deserves commisseration, and the pitying hand of benevolence? Certainly, and as certainly (in my opinion) is it a duty you owe to your own people, to provide first for them; but this will not do, a scheme must be adventured on, as unprecedented as it is chimerical, and as artful as it is unjust.[130]

---

127 Norris, pp. 77-8; 130 ff. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim (including italicisation) from original source. The exact sum raised was £31,306 and 7 shillings.

128 Thrush, p. 1.

129 Picciotto, p. 285. Translator's note: The fact that these were children is particularly important given that it was known that the Society targetted the most indigent Jews in society for proselytism, and one could particularly understand a child beggar being induced to identify as a Christian, if it meant being given hot meals, shelter, clothing, and perhaps even a chance of learning a trade.

130 Goodman, p. 13. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. For a profile of Tobias Goodman, author and synagogue preacher, see the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 6 p. 45 (s.v. GOODMAN, TOBIAS).

This brief summary of events regarding the London Society may suffice for our purposes. What conclusions can we draw from this? First of all, it is noticeable that there were branches of the Society in at least 100 towns and cities in England. If this organisation had really been solely concerned with the conversion of Jews, it would only have maintained such offices in the dozen or so places which then had a reasonable Jewish population.

More than anything, a large part of the population was taught that the old prejudice against Jews was completely wrong and that it was high time that the poor Jews received forbearance and understanding, to compensate for all the persecution they had suffered. And as we have seen, vast amounts of resources were also directed out of the Christian community to the benefit of the Jewish community, to the extent that these resources were not completely wasted.

Furthermore, in the highest circles, insofar as this had not already happened, the Jew and his people were made socially acceptable. The same success was also recorded among the clergy, as the donations and participation demonstrate.

Our view is merely an inference from the given facts. We shall decline to address whether these consequences were intended by the Society's sponsors and board members. Determining the subjective side of an action is always quite difficult. For this reason that is not our aim, which is solely to gauge the empirical results that all of this activity had, intentionally or unintentionally, on furthering Jewish advancement in British society.

Laws of Attrition

The period from 1754 to the dawn of the open emancipation struggle in 1830 could be described as a preparatory period for the coming major offensive. Through the methods mentioned, it was possible to weaken the enemy's defence lines, which is best compared in the propaganda that the Reds developed at the front and within the Fatherland in the final years of the Great War. Slowly, almost invisibly, the seeds sown by the Jews and their allies grew in the hearts of the people. While the term ‘Jew’ was the epitome of everything bad in mid-18th-century England, by 1839 this had fundamentally changed for part of the English nation. However, it was more a case of the ruling classes giving up their initially hostile position for purely material advantage, than the populace itself changing its stance. In addition, liberal ideas about the supposed equality of all became more prevalent in the public space. But just as a good general secures favourable starting positions for the final attack through small, successful operations, thereby simultaneously increasing the confidence and courage of the troops, so the Jews and their friends created positions for themselves that were bound to be of considerable value in the final confrontation.

These small, successful operations consisted of the laws that were passed in Parliament and other important bodies, which individually only signified a small win, but together became a valuable gain for Judah. The laws initially looked harmless and often did not even contain any reference to the Jews. We like to call these types of laws ‘laws of attrition’. As a result, one piece after another was gradually broken out of the defensive wall, which initially only showed small cracks and chips, without revealing to the casual observer the systematic nature of the attacks and the danger of the entire wall collapsing.

One of the laws, or rather an administrative regulation, led to the admission of Jews as solicitors in 1770.

In England there are two types of practitioners of the law: solicitors and barristers. The former do not need any academic studies or even higher education. Instead, five years of practical training with a licensed solicitor, two intermediate exams and a final exam are sufficient to qualify. However, they can usually only appear in the lower courts, while barristers have no restrictions in this regard. The latter have higher education and have completed university education; they correspond to the status of our current lawyers in Germany.

Solicitors are by no means to be equated with our litigation agents. They play a greater role in that they negotiate almost exclusively with the public and, in principle, only through them is the connection established with the barrister, who hardly has any personal contact with the litigant.

This brief summary may suffice to show that a far greater influence on the public can be exercised by the solicitor. As a result, the Jews could be quite satisfied with their success. Here, too, we must point out their recurring tactic of striving with all determination to not only get to know the law of a country, but also to be significantly involved in the development of the law, which we have seen with their political lobbying, and in their desire to be admitted as lawyers and later as judges and members of Parliament. The large percentage of Jewish lawyers in all major cities of the world speaks eloquently to this fact.

On 23rd January 1770, Joseph Abrahams was the first Jew to receive the honour of being admitted as an Attorney of the King’s Bench, having been articled as a solicitor’s clerk in 1763. On

13th February 1770, he was sworn in as a solicitor in Chancery, being relieved of the aforementioned Oath of Abjuration by being permitted to omit the last words, 'upon the true faith of a Christian',[131] and was just one of the later numerous Jews who were permitted to do this.

It is not surprising that the Jews managed to gain a foothold in solicitors' circles so early on, as they had already won over many followers during the events of 1753. In any case, this new position gave them a wide scope for increasing their power, especially given that more of their ethnic kin soon joined them in the profession.

They also received tax relief. As already explained, in principle every foreigner had to pay a special 'alien duty' to the state when exporting or importing goods. With varying degrees of success, the Jews had tried to have these fees abolished under various governments. However, their aim was not to be at the mercy of individual governments, but rather to bring about a general abolition. This goal was achieved when Parliament abolished all alien duties in 1784.[132]

We have also seen that the Hebrews had been seeking the right to be granted naturalisation for some time, because this was the only way to obtain the same legal status as an Englishman.

As is well known, the prerequisite was to take the Anglican sacrament [of the Last Supper] and to take the oaths, which was impossible for them as Jews.[133] They had therefore sought a law that would enable them to obtain citizenship. The events of 1753 proved how successful this was. But 1825 was supposed to bring about change. There were no more street demonstrations, let alone serious difficulties in Parliament, and almost nothing is recorded about the negotiations. According to this new law, 6 Geo. IV, c. 67, which abolished the requirement for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, naturalisation took place when the applicant had taken the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, which Jews could take without difficulty because they did not contain the fatal final words of the Oath of Abjuration.[134] What a change from the events of 1753! For the sake of completeness, it should be mentioned that further technical simplifications were introduced through corresponding laws in 1844 and 1870.[135]

The 1826 repeal of the previously discussed Alien Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 4), which was passed to protect England against the excessive immigration of undesirable elements, aroused just as little attention. The provisions contained in the Alien Act, according to which the authorities could restrict aliens to certain districts as deemed 'necessary for publick security', may have been quite uncomfortable for the Jews. The English public took little notice of the repeal of this law, which was replaced by the Registration of Aliens Act (7 Geo. IV, c. 54), a law which was much more favourable to foreigners.[136]

Undoubtedly, these partial successes gave the Jews and their allies the courage to make new advances. In addition, the question of Catholic emancipation had dominated the public square for years. A review of the contemporary parliamentary debates in Hansard will convince the reader of how much of a burning issue Catholic emancipation had become in domestic politics. The Jews did

131 Henriques: *Jews*, pp. 205-6; *Records of the Society of Gentleman Practisers*, p. 288.
132 *Statutes at Large*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 460-2.
133 Henriques: *Jews*, pp. 289-9.
134 *Statutes of the United Kingdom*, Vol. 65, p. 316.
135 Henriques: *Jews*, p. 245. Translator's note: Mr. Hutt's Naturalisation Act of 1844 (7 and 8 Vict., c. 66), introduced the convenient system of acquiring British nationality by means of a certificate from a Secretary of State. The system was further improved and extended by the 1870 Naturalization Act (33 and 34 Vict. c. 14). In addition, readers should also be made aware of the 1796 statute (36 Geo. III, c. 48) which allowed Jews to obtain naturalisation in Ireland, a naturalisation would of course be valid for the British Isles.
136 Henriques: *Jews*, p. 232. Translator's note: Quoted element from *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 43, p. 16.

not yet openly promote their own cause, but supported the Catholics, citing the principle of religious freedom. It is probably thanks to this joint co-operation that the repeal process of the so-called ‘Corporation and Test Act’ was begun in early 1828.

According to the Corporation Act of 1661 (13 Car. II, st. 2, c. 1), among other things, no one could hold office in a public legal entity, such as a municipal corporation or hold a Crown office, if he had not attended the Anglican sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the year prior to his appointment. Due to an additional law of 1718 (5 Geo. I, c. 6), the election to such an office of a non-qualified person was no longer void from the outset, but had to be challenged within a six months of his election to the office. The so-called Test Act of 1673 (25 Car. II, c. 2) also required all Crown officials, whether civil or military, to take the sacrament in an Anglican church no later than three months after their appointment, and make a declaration against transubstantiation. With both acts, the candidate for office also had to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy.

These laws made it impossible for Jews and Catholics to hold state and municipal positions. Both communities therefore had a crucial interest in their repeal.[137]

At the beginning of 1828, a bill for the abolition of both acts was submitted to Parliament.

For the first time we meet Lord John Russell, the third son of the Duke of Bedford, who was born in 1792,. While abroad in July 1813, at his father’s direction he was elected as member of Parliament for Tavistock, his family’s borough, despite being a month under the minimum age [21]. From that point onwards, Russell the Whig politician cannot be ignored as a champion of all kinds of so-called freedoms in the religious and political fields.[138] It is no surprise that in later years, assisted by Benjamin Disraeli and Rothschild's son Nathan Mayer, he became the driving force behind the emancipation of the Jews.

On February 26th, 1828, Russell introduced a bill to repeal the Corporation and Test Act, supported by a petition to Parliament from the City of London,[139] and justified by Lord John Russell on the grounds that the laws were outdated and incompatible with the principles of religious freedom.[140] The bill received widespread support, but there was also no lack of opposition who rightly feared that the passing of this bill would only be the prelude to other measures to grant further so-called freedoms.[141] Lord John Russell still found a majority in Parliament. The new law provided for a simple solemn declaration as a replacement for the Lord's Supper, which Catholics and Jews could easily make when taking office.[142]

In order to be fully legal, the law still had to be approved by the House of Lords, which insisted on the addition of the sworn phrase ‘upon the true faith of a Christian’. This had to have come as a bombshell for the friends of the Jews. While people had previously made a point of avoiding any mention of the Jews as a group, they now felt they had to change this strategy. Lord Holland considered the Lords’ addition to be completely impossible because it would disadvantage the Jews. But if the words were to be nevertheless inserted, one would have to give special permission to leave them out. Surprisingly, the Duke of Wellington, who was generally not opposed to Jews, turned against Lord Holland. In opposition to him, the Duke spoke in favour of the House

137 Henriques: *Jews*, pp. 247-9.
138 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XVII, p. 454 ff.
139 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council*, Vol. 1827, pp. 29-62; Vol. 1828, p. 11.
140 *Hansard*, New Series Vol. XVIII, pp. 677-694.
141 *Hansard*, New Series Vol. XVIII, p. 707.
142 *Hansard*, New Series Vol. XVIII, pp. 677 ff,; 816-833, 1180-1208, 1329 ff., 1450 ff., 1571 ff.

of Lords' proposal because he perceived what were likely to be long-term unforeseen consequences of such changes, having seen the precedent established with another religious group:

> It was proposed that the words ‘on the true faith of a Christian’ should be left out of the Declaration with the view of admitting the Jews to office. For his own part, he did not believe it to be the intention of the law that Jews should, be so admitted: he did not believe that it was the intention of the laws that Dissenters should be admitted. But, be that as it might, they had for the last eighty years gone on suspending these laws, and it was notorious that Dissenters had been admitted into corporations, although it was the object of the original laws to keep them out. Now, it appeared that the legislature was perfectly well aware that Dissenters were admitted into corporations… Did not the legislature, then, know very well that Dissenters were admitted into corporations? Was not this law a proof that they were acquainted with the fact? It was not so, however, with the Jews. There was no instance in which the legislature had sanctioned the admission of such persons into office. Under these circumstances, therefore, he must oppose the proposition for expunging the words ‘on the true faith of a Christian.’ But there was another reason why they ought to remain. It was quite a new principle, and disliked by this country, that Jews should be admitted into corporations and public offices. If, however, the principal was to be recognised, let that question be fairly brought forward, and not be introduced, on the third reading, into a bill which originally contemplated nothing of the kind.[143]

The victor of many battles for England refused to allow Jews back-door access to positions that should be reserved for the English, without this access being properly permitted through Parliamentary debate. Wellington's opinion prevailed, and so the bill was adopted only with the proviso that the final words fatal to the Jews were to be added to the declaration. The bill was thereby amended and sent back to the House of Commons for approval. There were further extensive debates in the lower Chamber. Almost needless to say, various MPs were not satisfied with the new version. It is almost astonishing how the word ‘Jew’ was studiously avoided during the debates. Any casual observer would have been forgiven for thinking that it was all just a dispute between the Anglicans and the Protestant Dissenters.[144]

Lord Russell spoke once more during that sitting. Given his later stance on the Jewish Question, we would like to reproduce what we consider to be the most important part of his speech:

> The words which had been added to the Declaration by the Lords, could not be considered objectionable as a Declaration of religious opinions, for they were not so intended. The Church of the country was Christian; and to whatever denomination of Christians a man might belong, he could not object to declare, ‘on the true faith of a Christian’; for when a party so declared, he could be understood to mean only on the faith of that community of Christians to which he belonged. The intentions of the Lords were, that a man should give a solemn assent to Christianity, without pointing out any

143 *Hansard*, Vol. XIX, pp. 167-8. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
144 *Hansard*, Vol. XIX, pp. 290-5.

> particular sect of Christians. He did not think the Declaration was at all necessary; for many who were not Christians would not hesitate to take it.[145]

In his opinion it would therefore be the case that the Jew would not mind swearing these words, contrary to their religious principles. But Lord John must have been misinformed by his friends, because it was precisely due to the Hebrews rejecting these words that a decades-long battle broke out. Given Lord John Russell's insouciant attitude, it is not surprising that the House of Commons passed the bill with the amendments requested by the Lords, making it legally binding.[146] All of the pent-up anger of the Jews' allies came to the fore again when MP Henry Brougham – who later continued to campaign heavily for the Jews in the House of Commons – took the floor immediately after the final important vote. In order to avoid a long debate, he had remained silent up until that point, but now spoke to express his ‘entire disapprobation’ of the Lords’ amendments, and to add his voice regarding ‘the injustice done to the Quakers and Jews’.[147]

All of Judah’s efforts had thus proved fruitless: although the requirement to take the Lord's Supper had been waived, the Lords’ insistence on the fatal wording of the oath had created a new, insurmountable obstacle. The situation had gone from bad to worse. But in the following year, 1829, there was to be a victory, if only an indirect one.

145 *Hansard*, Vol. XIX, p. 296. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. This debate is particularly interesting for its revelation of the extent to which Christianity as a faith had declined among some of the leading Englishmen of the day.

146 *Statute of the United Kingdom*, Vol. 68, pp. 22-25.

147 *Hansard*, Vol. XIX, p. 299. Translator’s note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source. Note the subordinate placing of ‘Jews’ in Brougham’s list, the second of only two references to Jews in the entire Hansard record of the debate.

The Fall of the City of London, the Bulwark of the Anti-Jewish Movement

The Jews believed that, thanks to their partial previous successes, the preparations had progressed to such an extent that they could soon make the final assault. Over the course of the preceding narrative it has been possible for the reader to chart the growth of Jewish power and the slow destruction of opposition forces. The City of London had been prominent among the Jews' opponents since Cromwell's time, and it was mainly the City which had rallied the populace against the Jewish law in 1753. This bulwark had to fall. It was, and continues to be, the heart of the British Empire, with all of the world-dominating banks and trading houses within its walls. Then, as now, there was little the British government could do that had not been approved by the men of the City. So anyone who wanted to achieve something meaningful could not possibly afford to have the City against him. Judah had experienced this firsthand all too clearly and had therefore taken the appropriate precautions.

The role that individual Hebrews played in the government's financial policy has already been discussed. Rich Jewish trading houses worked hand in hand with government ministers. The Jews' influence on the economy was therefore bound to increase from year to year. It was not always the actual Jewish companies themselves that came into question, but equally or even more so the English bankers and merchants who were directly or even indirectly dependent on the Hebrews, the latter thereby able to enjoy the advantage of making themselves almost invisible to the outside world. With the appearance of Rothschild in the City, this Jewish encroachment made significant progress and thus gradually reduced economic resistance to Judah. Rothschild's weapons and methods were extremely deadly, as even a pro-Jewish writer admits that Rothschild ruthlessly ruined opponents or forced them under his yoke if they capitulated:

> Your Grace, who I have no doubt is well read in history, knows, that at every period of society the Jews have, by their industry, frugality, and perseverance, monopolized that might lever of men's minds, money; and that, notwithstanding the cruelties, oppressions, spoliations inflicted on them by their savage persecutors the Catholics, they have still preserved that privilege, and kept their enemies in a state of bondage. That at no other period of society the case has been more proved than at the present moment, is fully demonstrated by the servile obsequiousness which all the Crowned heads in Europe spontaneously evince towards the most extraordinary Jew who has ever existed since the remotest days of Moses [Rothschild]; and who, through his influence on the finances of all countries, could strike a docket against all governments, and make them bankrupts.[148]

What extent must this servitude have reached by 1830 if a subservient group had already been identified in the City as early as 1753, a group which, apparently under pressure from the Jews, approached Parliament with a pro-Jewish petition against all public opinion. People who still refuse to believe in their indirect influence today should just take a look at England and France, or

148 Anichini, p. 9. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

remember our times before 1933. Here in Germany, the publication of sobering statistics, all based on documentation, lays out the case only too clearly.[149]

We therefore have no doubt that by then the Hebrews had gained predominance in the City, mainly through the English bankers and merchants who were dependent on them. Their willing creatures sat everywhere in City offices, and so the time had to come when the oldest bulwark against Jewish power would fall. It will probably never be possible to determine when exactly this happened. Clear signs were certainly visible in the petitions that the City's Common Council sent to Parliament in favour of Catholic emancipation, which stood in contrast to the City's previous policy and which were obviously intended to help pave the way for Jewish emancipation.

But for all the actual power the Jews wielded in the City of London, it had still been impossible for them to gain the freedom of the City. To acquire this privilege, it was an indispensable requirement to swear an oath on the New Testament, which the Jews refused. As early as 1739 – as part of the first wave of emancipation that was already beginning – the Jews tried to take the oath on the Old Testament, which even led to a lawsuit after the City's administration refused to accept the oath. During the court case, the chief justice asked the City aldermen to explain their reasoning for the otherwise qualified Jew Abraham Rathom not being able to swear the oath in the form he liked. The City cited the ancient custom and refused to make any changes. After long negotiations, the chief justice announced the verdict that the City's handling of the matter complied with the law, and the court had no right to interfere in the form of the City's oaths. After that event, the Jews no longer dared to address the issue directly, and it would be almost another century before they achieved their aim.

But the situation was more than unedifying for Judah. London was still their actual place of settlement, where they could not receive the rights of Englishmen despite becoming naturalised in Great Britain. This was a general inconvenience to them, but it also brought individual disadvantages. Wholesale commerce within the City of London was still permitted to those who did not have freedom of the City. However, the retail trade desired by the lower classes was forbidden to non-freemen.

After 1820, fundamental disagreements emerged between the City's two main administrative bodies, the Court of Aldermen and the Common Council.

The former consisted of 26 aldermen, from whose ranks the mayor was elected. Among other privileges, the Court of Aldermen had the power to appoint certain offices and exercised judicial functions in regard to licensing. With each alderman being a judge and magistrate, the Court also had official control over the City. The aldermen were also members of the Common Council, which consisted of 232 members and was the legislative body of the City of London Corporation.[150] The friends of the Jews, half-Jews, and baptised Jews were more likely to gain access to the Common Council, whose members were elected annually by the freemen, as the Common Council could be seen as comparable to the assembly or citizenry of a city, with the Court of Aldermen being roughly equivalent to the Senate.

It is to the Court of Aldermen's credit that, in compliance with existing laws and despite the pressure that was very likely exerted on it to do otherwise, it took action against Jews who were running small trading businesses in the City without permission and against the legal regulations. This must have been a very extensive problem because the Common Council decided on March 5th,

149 See the official work: *Die Juden in Deutschland.*
150 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, Vol. I, p. 533 (s. v. Alderman). *Dictionary of London (*1918), pp. 6, 165.

1824 to appoint a committee to investigate the issue. It was declared illegal to engage in small-scale trade without freedom of the city. The goods of violators were to be confiscated without delay and forfeited to the state. After very careful investigation in the individual districts of the City, the committee had determined that, despite this risk, a large number of people were carrying on petty trade in open defiance of the law, without being freemen of the City. It happened under the guise of being a wholesaler, as the official report shows. According to this, ‘a number of wholesalers constantly display goods for sale to the public and sell them in the retail trade to the detriment of those who keep open shops’. Thus it was deemed urgent that strict measures be taken against these miscreants.[151]

Apparently, however, there were no further special measures taken by the Common Council, which certainly fits with the later attitude of this City body. The Court of Aldermen, however, had apparently taken the necessary lawful steps. In 1829, the aforementioned pro-Jewish writer Apsley Pellatt, who was also a member of the Common Council, complained that:

> In the few instances where Jews have taken retail shops in the City, they have been harrassed by repeated processes from the Lord Mayor’s Court Office, and at length obliged to quit their houses, perhaps at a sacrifice, on payment of legal costs.

Lawbreakers are therefore pitied when existing laws are applied to them. Pellatt goes so far as to describe the regulations in question as ‘a bigoted system’ which was ‘absurd and illiberal’ and ‘the legacy of the dark ages’.[152]

Pellatt asserts that there were only a few Jews who were found to be offending. What information does the official report provide in this regard? It states that in 1825 there were 142 offenders, in 1826: 303 offenders, in 1827: 600 offenders, in 1828: 1128 offenders, and in 1829: 1561 offenders, making a total of 3289 offenders (that were documented).[153]

These numbers are very revealing in several respects. Based on the information already presented, it should be self-evident that the largest percentage of these offenders were Jews. It also appears that from 1825 to 1829 the number of lawbreakers increased enormously. It is unlikely to be a coincidence that this increase is particularly evident after 1824, which is when it was clear that no measures would be taken against this criminal behaviour, despite the recommendations of the committee appointed by the Common Council. This created an incentive for such lawbreakers to defy the law more than ever before. Of course, as always on such occasions, it can no longer be determined whether there was even encouragement from certain quarters.

Furthermore, from these incidents further insight can be gained into general Jewish tactics.

Jews often gain their first foothold by blatantly breaking the law. At first it is ignored for some reason, probably because most people do not like trouble, and to go against certain individuals, who to the casual observer appear to be doing no real harm, can backfire badly on the person trying to raise the alarm. Not being challenged, the Jews then gradually expand their position in terms of

---

151 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1827, pp. 138-140.

152 Pellatt, pp. 24, 26-7. Translator’s note: All quotations reproduced verbatim from original source. As the reader may imagine, Pellatt was equally horrified by the proposal put forward to solve the problem, namely, that the privileges of the City freemen should be extended to wholesale as well as retail trade.

153 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1830, pp. 79-80.

numbers and power, although still working covertly so that it is difficult for the public to see what is happening. With their new authority they intertwine as large a number of fellow Jews as possible into their network, but especially also local people. At some point, there is a build-up of counter-pressure from the host population, a natural reaction to the untenable situation created by the Hebrews, which inevitably leads to an open determination of the facts and corresponding measures to counter the problem. At this point not only the Jews feel threatened in their illegally acquired position, but also the non-Jews who have become dependent on them. The aggrieved Jews and their allies start screaming blue murder, demanding that the outdated, inhumane laws that are still on the books be abolished unquestionably because, as evidence of anti-Jewish persecution, they endanger the very existence of Jews. We will see how, in the course of further events, this method was used purposefully and assiduously by the Jews, and had the same good results for the Children of Israel in 19th-century England as it has had in all countries and epochs.

Incidentally, while such Jewish protests are going on, the public, or at least the printed press posing as public opinion, often mock the ‘narrow-mindedness’ and ‘bigotry’ of those who are determined to stick to their ancestors’ traditional usages. The same forces also pity those who have gotten into trouble because of these ‘ridiculous’ ancient laws, although in such cases it is usually overlooked that it is the Jews themselves who have created their own predicament through their overreaching and disregard for others, which means that by rights they should be made to bear the consequences of their own illicit actions. Even today, this Jewish appeal to the compassion of the masses who are not yet enlightened about Jewish behaviour [the *argumentum ad misericordiam* fallacy], always yields the best results.

The Court of Aldermen's antipathy towards the Jews is clearly shown by another incident.

Never in the history of England has such a conscious attitude towards race been observed as that seen in one of the resolutions made by this public body. This resolution stated: ‘That it is the opinion of this Court, that it is neither politic nor advisable in this Corporation to admit baptized Jews into the freedom of this City, and that it be observed as a standing order.’ In a legal dispute, descendants of baptised Jews tried to challenge this provision, especially if they came from a mixed marriage. But here too the Court of Aldermen prevailed and determined that such descendants could be excluded from the privileges of the City, given that the City was free to grant or refuse its freedom to any applicant at its own discretion. But it was again the Court of Common Council, as the legislative power of the city, which intervened after the ordinance of the Court of Aldermen had existed for twelve or thirteen years, and had it repealed in 1829.[154]

Any remaining doubts about the pro-Jewish sympathies of the Common Council must have been dispelled on June 19th, 1829. We can only describe this day as decisive in the struggle for Jewish emancipation. From that day on it was clear that the City had opened its gates wide to the enemy through gradual subversion, mainly from within. That day it was decided to ask a committee ‘to report on the municipal and legal restrictions which prevented Jews from doing business in the City of London, while they had not become freemen’.[155]

It is surprising that even at that stage the forces of self-preservation were apparently still resisting foreign infiltration. It was not until April 1st, 1830 that the various reports on the matter were published. With the exception of the Court of Aldermen, it was considered possible and sufficient to change the law through a simple administrative City ordinance. The former, however,

154 Pellatt, pp. 26-27. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
155 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1829, [19 June 1829], p. 68.

believed that, as a result of centuries of practice, the City was bound by its own law, which could only be repealed by a formal act of Parliament. It also considered the admission of Jews impossible, because of their incompatibility with the Christian religion, which had become an indispensable, essential part of all English law. Finally, it warned against foreign infiltration, which would lead to undesirable consequences.[156] The four other experts who were called upon, however, held a different opinion and considered that the admission of Jews as freemen was possible, as there was nothing to prevent them making the necessary oath on the Old Testament. The previous rulings of the Supreme Court on this matter could no longer be considered acceptable in that day and age.[157] People went along with these expert arguments and ignored the one dissenting voice of warning. The path to freedom of the City was clear for Judah. The full proposal for the new regulations was published on September 3rd, 1830;[158] it was debated on December 6th and adopted four days later, on December 10th of the same year.[159]

It was not long before the first Jew applied to become a freeman. Judah Jacobs was the first to apply for this privilege, on February 2nd, 1831.[160] A glance at the relevant document register is enough to see the large number of Hebrews who took advantage of his victory in the years that followed.[161]

Jews – Freemen of the City of London!

They finally achieved their goal.

The City, which had defied the Jews for so long, had finally opened its gates to them. Soon it would be the bulwark of the Hebrews, from which they would launch attack after attack on the last of their enemies' positions. If the Jews were finally victorious after an emancipation struggle of 28 years, this fact alone was the key to their success.

Anyone who undertakes to free England from Jewish rule must first recapture the City of London. Whoever defeats them will see in England's organisational structure the means of finally asserting his power in the country.

156 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1830, pp. 40-2.
157 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1830, pp. 42-5. Translator's note: A topical alternative translation of 'die heutige Zeit' could be 'the current year', given that this argument is the 'appeal to modernity' [argumentum ad novitatem] fallacy.
158 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1830, p. 103.
159 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1830, pp. 164, 170-1.
160 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1831, p. 18.
161 *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council,* Vol. 1831-1832.

Translator's Appendix

The following article is important for giving the modern reader a sense of what was really being said behind closed doors in late Georgian England, which was often far from the narrative disseminated by the mainstream press of the time (such narratives being often mistaken for 'public opinion' by historians). The newspaper from which it comes, *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, was steadfastly independent, with its publisher William Cobbett refusing to take advertisements for the same reason. This indomitable self-taught Surrey farmer, who published the parliamentary debates that were to become the forerunner of Hansard, stood alone against the tide of power. Refusing to be cowed by imprisonment and forced bankruptcy after being vexatiously sued by the British government for seditious libel in 1810, he may usefully be seen as the last public figure in English history to openly critique Judaism and Jewish power. His pamphlet, *Good Friday, Or, The Murder of Jesus Christ by the Jews* (1830), is certainly the last example of what is known as 'religious anti-Semitism' by a public figure in England, and it did not prevent Cobbett from being elected to Parliament two years after its publication. Sadly, with his death in 1835 there was no-one to replace his independent voice in the English media landscape, and with his death we may usefully mark the end of an era for England. The previous most prominent anti-Jewish writers in English history were his namesakes William Prynne (17th century) and William Romaine (18th century), who have been discussed in previous volumes.

Jewish Predominance

[From *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register,* Vol. X, No. 10 (Sept 6th, 1806): pp. 403-6. Written under the pseudonym 'Ethnicus' but almost certainly authored by Cobbett himself. Asterisked footnotes and square-bracketed text have been inserted to aid reader comprehension.]

> 'Non possum ferre, Quirites,
> Gracam urbem' – JUVENAL
> ['I cannot abide, Quirites, a Rome of Greeks' – JUVENAL]

Sir,

I observe you have not inserted in your Register the dazzling description given by a certain Jew broker of his new palace in Surrey, and the magnificent feast he lately gave there to our princes and nobles. Perhaps you think it has been sufficiently published already; and indeed I must confess it has for the last ten days, thrown the affairs of Europe very much into the background. But there are so many interesting considerations arising out of all this splendour, that I am persuaded you will not refuse me a corner of your paper to moralize upon it.

But you will observe in passing, that I do not exactly say the description in question was written by the broker himself, any more than that he built his own barouche, or engraved that portrait of him which appears in the shops with both arms loaded, not with omnium*, but with vast

rolls of his public charities and contributions. So far from being the author himself, I do not suspect him of having ever written a sentence in any language whatever. But it is an additional proof of his liberal spirit, that he exercises and rewards the talents of our writers, architects, painters, poets and musicians, and even charms colonel Pattypan himself to lay down the truncheon and repair to Morden with the rolling pin.**

I am not ignorant that Mr. Cumberland, in his Life, solemnly declares that he was not paid a farthing by the synagogue, or any individual Jew, for writing his comedy of that name. This looks like an imputation on the liberality of the race; but Mr. Cumberland should consider, that he has indiscreetly overdone the part; and, that a Jew who gives away his money for the mere pleasure of doing good, without show or profit, is such a monstrous caricature as no real Jew can see without contempt. It is only with us simpler Christians that the play has had any influence, and I will not dispute with Mr. Cumberland, that it may have assisted us to shake off those suspicions and prejudices which so long held our Jewish inmates in the condition of rats, always persecuted but never extirpated, nor prevented from purloining our victuals.

Till lately, the richest Jews amongst us affected poverty for fear of envy, and ate their unleavened cakes and counted their usuries in secret. But now they are the companions of our feasts, the pride of our assemblies, the arbiters of our amusements.

This speculation becomes important, when it is considered, that the remarkable changes we have spoken of are chiefly connected with the growth of the commercial spirit among us. Indeed the treatment of the Jews from the beginning, has always been milder in proportion to the commercial advancement of the states in which they lived. How sadly forlorn were they, for example, in the pasturing countries of Assyria and Babylon! How different there the state of the homeless exile, hanging up his harp in despair on the willows, from that of our modern broker, with the military bands of a whole county cheering his feasts on the banks of the Wandle? And, in the same way, France is now giving us a pleasing proof, if any were wanting, of the lamentable condition of her trade, by the harsh measures she is taking with her Jewish citizens. Bonaparte must needs inquire *why they do not work* and conform to the institutions of his other subjects; whilst, in our commercial state, if they are *wealthy*, no other question is asked. They may then dig wells, and build houses, and plant trees, on the very soil where our boasted Nelson was wont to relax himself (in far humbler stile, alas!) from his severer labours!

It is likewise obvious, that Bonaparte’s funding system must be very different from ours, else he would not dare to discompose the Jews. Let Moses Jacobson say what he pleases about tilling the rocks of Palestine, it is certain the race are not of a temper to submit to agriculture or mechanical trades; and let Bonaparte do what he can, he never shall make them regular artizans, any more than Pharaoh could make them brick makers. We see that every soul of them, male or female, takes with alacrity to traffick, from the children that sell shoe-strings and pick pockets near the Bank, up to the richest of the race.

It is all a nursery of commerce; the fountain of brokerage, exchange and barter; and the living principle of all kinds of jobbing and huckstery. Tremble, ye statesmen, to touch this hallowed confederation? A whole ministry may be turned out (all but the commander in chief) and the nation proceed no worse, but the hair of a Jew’s beard must not be singed, lest our gold become paper, our paper assignats, lest our stocks vanish into air, and loans become impossible.

Let us not be stunned here with the cry of illiberality. I despise no man for his country, lineage or religion. If a German, a Frenchman, a Spaniard, or a man of any other country settle amongst us, he soon coalesces and becomes amalgamated with the rest of us, and at any rate his progeny is sure to be English. But a Jew is of no nation, and his children are Jews, never uniting and coalescing with any other race, but making it their religion and their study to remain distinct and separate from all. They are united together though spread in all countries, a mass widely extending amongst other materials, but gravitating uniformly and alone to its own centre. Such an enormous confederacy, like the Jesuits of late, all engaged in one pursuit, and held together by perpetual correspondence, might well be the object of jealousy, but surely neither requires nor deserves superior indulgence, or fostering kindness.

It is far from me, Sir, to envy any man his riches, neither is my bile moved by the pomp of a Jew broker. But I am grieved that any one should have gained the most amiable and most accomplished of princes to decorate his triumph. Wealth, especially in a land of trade, must always draw its full share of deference and attention, and be sufficiently admired by the multitude. It is, therefore, the proper glory, and, I may say, the duty of our prince, when at any time he steps out of his court, to bend his countenance and favour so as to reward distinguished merit, or to illustrate that which is obscure, I should delight to see him visiting the humble dwelling of DAVID LEVI, or any other Jew eminent for learning and intellect, instead of swelling the state of Abraham Goldsmidt. Or when high rank requires the vicissitudes of humbler society, I am not singular in saying, that I would rather see the heir apparent at the Boar's Head in Eastcheap (like his great predecessor) 'touching the base string of humility' with another Poins,† than worshipping (like princes of another race) a thing of gold. But I believe it was an unconsidered and good natured act, and certainly he did not suspect that our prints should be taught to publish to all the world, that he condescended, at a Jewish feast, with the High Chancellor and other great ministers of the king about him, *to pronounce studied eulogiums* on exchange brokers, and to mix his princely voice with Jews and Jewesses in singing the song of Moses in their tabernacles.

I am, Sir, with very great respect, your obedient humble servant,

ETHNICUS

*The total of the different stocks and other items formerly offered by the British government for the capital subscribed in funding a loan or for a unit of subscribed capital.

**A joke in reference to the reactionary politician Samuel Birch (1757-1841), a dramatist and lover of the arts who was famously opposed to Roman Catholic emancipation, and who was nicknamed Colonel Patty-pan by satirists due to his early career as a pastrycook and confectioner.

†A reference to Edward 'Ned' Poins, a low-life associate of Prince Hal in Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part I, and Henry IV, Part II.

Volume 5 Bibliography

1. Alexander, L.: *Memoirs of the Life and Commercial Connections, Public and Private, of the Late Benj. Goldsmid, Esq.* (1808).
2. Alexander, L.: *Answer to Mr. Joshua van Oven's Letters* (1802).
3. Alger, J.: *Napoleon's British Visitors and Captives* (1904).
4. Anichini, P.: *A Few Remarks on the Expediency and Justice of Emancipating the Jews* (1829).
5. Archenholtz, J. W.: *A Picture of England* (1797).
6. Ballard, J.: *England in 1815* (1913).
7. Colquhoun, P.: *A Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis* (1796).
8. Corti, E: *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Rothschild* (1927).
9. Cumberland, R.: *The Jew, a Comedy* (1794).
10. Espriella, M. A.: *Letters from England*, 3 vols. (1808).
11. Francis, J.: *Chronicles and Charters of the Stock Exchange* (1855).
12. Goakman, B. R.: *The London Society Examined* (1816).
13. Goede, C. A.: *A Foreigner's Opinion of England*, 3 vols. (1821).
14. Goodman, R. T.: *An Address to the Committee of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews* (1809).
15. Grosely, P.: *A Tour of London*, Volume I (1772).
16. Halstead, T. D.: *Our Missions* (1866).
17. Henriques, H.: *Jews and the English Law* (1928).
18. Hertz, G. B.: *British Imperialism in the 18th Century* (1908).
19. Hyamson, A.: *A History of the Jews in England* (1928).
20. Kielmannsegge, F.: *Diary of a Journey to England* (1904).
21. Landa, M. J.: 'Kitty Villareal, the Da Costas and Samson Gideon', in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Volume XIII, p. 271 ff. (1934).
22. Las Cases, M.: *Memorial de Sainte Helène*, 4 vols. (1823).
23. Levy, M. E.: *Letters, Concerning the Present Condition of the Jews…* (1829).
24. ——: *Speech Delivered at a Meeting…* (1829).
25. Martin, F.: *History of Lloyds* (1876).
26. McNair Wilson, R.: *Napoleon, the Portrait of a King* (1937).
27. Meister, J. H.: *Letters Written During a Residence in England* (1799).
28. de Mesquita, D. B.: 'The Historical Associations', in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Vol. X, p. 225 ff. (1924).
29. *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court of Common Council from 1823-1830*, 3 vols.
30. Moritz, C. P.: *Travels Chiefly on Foot through England* (1798).
31. Nichols, J.: *Illustrations of the Literary History of the 18th Century*, 8 vols. (1831).
32. Norris, H. H.: *The Origin, Progress, & Existing Circumstances of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews* (1825).
33. van Oven, J.: *Letters on the Present State* (1802).
34. Pellatt, A.: *Brief Memoir of the Jews* (1829).
35. Picciotto, J.: *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (1875).
36. Pückler-Muskau, Prinz von: *Tour of a German Prince* (1832).

37. Records of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers (1897).
38. Reid, W. H.: *Causes and Consequences of the French Emperor's Conduct...* (1807).
39. *Report of the Society for Promoting Christianity* (1810 ff.)
40. Rumney, J.: 'Anglo-Jewry as seen through Foreign Eyes (1730-1830)' in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Volume XIII, p. 323 ff. (1930).
41. de Saussure, C.: *A Foreign View of England in the Reigns of George I and George II* (1902).
42. von Scherb, F.: *Geschichte des Hauses Rothschild* (1893).
43. Silliman, B.: *A Journal of Travels…* (1812).
44. Solomons, J.: 'Satirical and Political Prints' in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Volume VI (1910).
45. ——: 'Lord George Gordon's Conversion to Judaism' in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Volume VII, p. 222 ff. (1913).
46. Thrush, T.: *Letters to the Jews* (1829).
47. Wasserman, J.: *My Life as German and Jew* (1933).
48. Welch, C.: *Modern History of the City of London* (1898).
49. Wendeborn, G. F.: *View of England* (1791).
50. Williams, S.: *Richard Cumberland* (1917).
51. Witherby, T.: *An Attempt to Remove Prejudices* (1804).
52. Wolf, L.: *Essays in Jewish History* (1934).

Newspapers

1. *Times*
2. *Morning Post*

Translator's Bibliography

Aust, Cornelia: *The Jewish Economic Elite: Making Modern Europe.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press (2018).

Bermant, Chaim: *The Cousinhood: The Anglo-Jewish Gentry*, London: Eyre & Spottiswoode (1971).

Endelman. Todd M.: *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America (1979).

Felsenstein, Frank: *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture. 1660-1830.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press (1995).

Gidney, W. T. (Rev.): *The History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, From 1809 to 1908.* London: London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews (1908).

Lindemann, Albert S.: *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews.* New York: Cambridge University Press (1997).

Margolis, Max L.; Marx, Alexander: *A History of the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America (1934).

Mosse, Werner Eugen (ed.): *Revolution and Evolution, 1848 in German-Jewish History.* Tubingen: Leo Baeck Institut (1981).

Namier, L.; Brooke, J. (eds.): *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1754-1790.* London: Secker & Warburg (1964).
This reference book is online, and the entry for Sampson Gideon [latterly Eardley] can be found at: https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/gideon-%28afterwards-eardley-%29-sir-sampson-1745-1824

Pelham, Camden (ed.): *The Chronicles of Crime; or The New Newgate Calender*, Vol. I. London: T. Miles & Co. (1887).

Ryssen, Hervé: *Comprendre le judaïsme, comprendre l'antisémitisme*. Levallois-Perret: Baskerville (2012). Note that the 2014 English translation by Charles W. Porter (*Understanding the Jews, Understanding Anti-Semitism*) can also be found online.

Schroeter, Daniel J.: *The Sultan's Jew: Morocco and the Sephardi World.* Stanford: Stanford University Press (2002).